HISTORY

JANUARY, 1917.

THE MAKING OF AN IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

I.—By Prof. Ramsay Muir.

Professor Pollard's interesting and brilliantly written Creighton Lecture contains much that is suggestive and stimulating, but it seems to afford an example of the use of historical analogies for the purpose of demonstrating a political theory in a manner that is apt to be misleading.

Its object appears to be to demonstrate that we ought not to make any serious or systematic attempt to deal with the problem of Imperial organisation. At the most, it is suggested, we should invite a few Colonial statesmen to occupy seats in the House of Lords, and trust that all sorts of vague, wonderful consequences will flow from this simple device—apparently on the ground that our Parliamentary system originally sprang from the mediæval *Curia Regis*, and the House of Lords is the nearest modern equivalent to the *Curia Regis*.

The advocacy of such a view by a distinguished historian is perplexing. For one of the platitudes of the historian is that institutions are liable to change their character completely with the lapse of time, and that it is therefore highly unscientific to expect them to perform given functions in a late stage of their development merely because at an early stage they were capable of performing similar functions. Unquestionably, the House of Lords descends from the *Curia Regis*; and some curious features which distinguish it from other Second Chambers are due to this descent. But, equally undoubtedly, it is no longer the active and efficient centre of the whole system of government, as the *Curia Regis* once was; it does not perform, and it could never be made to perform, for the British Empire of to-day as a whole functions even remotely resembling those which the *Curia Regis* performed

for the feudal England of the twelfth century. As it now stands it is an institution somewhat out of touch with the rest of our system, and by the consent of all parties it will have to be reorganised. To suggest that it should undertake such wide, vague, and vitally important functions as Professor Pollard indicates merely on the ground that its remote predecessor was under totally different conditions successfully employed for quite different purposes is surely a rather fantastic kind of academic Toryism.

Professor Pollard's argument seems to rest upon two premisses, which are sound in themselves, and which are admirably and wittily expounded, but they do not bear the conclusion which is based upon them. These premisses are as follows :—

(1) The British Constitution as a whole was not deliberately planned and organised by any constitution-monger; some of its most characteristic institutions, like the Cabinet, came into existence almost by accident; others, including Parliament itself, were originally designed for purposes quite different from those which they later came to serve.

(2) In the case of America (no other case is mentioned or discussed), a constitution which *was* deliberately planned and organised has in practice led to some inconvenient and even absurd results, and has made progress in certain directions difficult for the American people.

The conclusions we are invited to draw from these two premisses are: (1) that "we cannot fuse free States into one by statute, convention, or conquest," and (2) that a deliberately organised system for the government of the British Empire is likely to lead to evil results of an undefined kind, and in particular to impose upon our descendants "constitutional bonds which our forefathers have not imposed upon us."

I submit that this is an illogical process of argument: first, because the two premisses omit or slur over certain highly relevant facts of vital importance; and, secondly, because the conclusion does not follow even from these imperfect premisses.

(1) It is true, as the first premiss asserts, that our institutions, like all institutions which have lived long, have come to serve a purpose different from that for which they were designed. But they were, in nearly every case, originally designed, quite deliberately, to serve *some* purpose. We should have had no institutions at all if successive generations of statesmen had not set themselves to create the institutions which were necessary to meet the needs of their time; and it is the duty of every

generation to consider its own needs, and either to adapt old institutions, or, where that is insufficient, to create new institutions in order to meet them. Edward I. did not contemplate the Parliament of to-day; that goes without saying. But when he summoned the Parliament of 1275 he did, in fact, deliberately organise a new machine of government, the Estates; and although it was linked with the *Curia Regis*, and owed much to Simon de Montfort and the experiments which preceded him, it was, in fact, a definite piece of constitution-making to meet what seemed a political need of the time. If this step had not been taken, the later Parliaments could never have developed.

"The issue," says Professor Pollard, "is one between human design and human evolution"; and, as a sound Tory, he is all for evolution. Ought we to draw any such sharp antithesis? Surely the development of all institutions is due to a combination of human design with evolution; and the part played by design becomes greater, the part played by unconscious evolution less, in proportion as men free themselves from the chains of mere custom and become more capable of sound reasoning upon the aims, methods, and limitations of political contrivances. Nay, the process of evolution itself is due in a large measure to the deliberate and conscious adaptation of institutions to meet particular and often momentary needs.

It would be tedious to follow Professor Pollard through all his ingenious illustrations. In regard to them all the same truth holds. A system of government remains beneficent and progressive only if each generation, while avoiding restless innovation and mere destruction, is alive to the problems which surround it, and is willing and able, and not afraid, to alter old institutions or invent new in order to deal with these problems.

It is instructive that Professor Pollard fixes all his attention upon the British system, which alone could supply even a plausible basis for his paradox. Yet the British system is not the only system in the world which works; all the others have been deliberately organised by "human design." And even in the history of British institutions there are some episodes which Professor Pollard finds a difficulty in accommodating to his theory that "human design" has no important part in the development of a healthy system of government. For example, there is the Union of England and Scotland. Professor Pollard urges that it was really brought about, not by a mere Parliamentary enactment, but by a gradual process which caused ancient rancours to be forgotten and created a sense of comrade-

ship and common interest. That is perfectly true. But when this process had reached a certain point a quite formal constitutional enactment, full of detailed provisions, had to be passed. And if the Act of Union had *not* been passed it would have been merely futile to hope that "formal unity" would have "come in course of time." Nor was the existence of a sense of common interests in British North America or in Australia enough of itself without any constitutional devices; the definite enactment of Federal systems was necessary, and if these enactments had not been made it is impossible to say what would have been the later history of these great dominions. May it not reasonably be said that the sense of comradeship and common interest among the members of the British Empire has now reached such a stage that it demands embodiment in a constitutional form comparable to the Act of Union or the Canadian and Australian and South African Federal Acts? That is at least an arguable question; it cannot be disposed of by the mere assertion—the highly disputable assertion—that in the British system such enactments never happen or are never necessary, for they have happened repeatedly.

(2) In his second premiss Professor Pollard is concerned to show that a deliberately designed or written constitution may lead to awkward results. He fixes his attention exclusively upon the American constitution. But the American is not the only written constitution. Why does he give us no discussion of the Third French Republic, for example? Why does he never mention the British colonial constitutions, all of which were deliberately organised and defined in writing? Was it because the American system provided the most pungent illustrations of the difficulties that may arise from extreme rigidity? But extreme rigidity is not a necessary attribute of all deliberately devised and formally enacted systems. The reason why it was for so long impossible to levy an income-tax in America was not that the American constitution was deliberately devised and embodied in a written Act, but that the machinery provided for altering its provisions was so complex that it was almost impossible to put it into operation. Other written constitutions have guarded against this defect; and Professor Pollard gravely misleads his readers—of course unintentionally—when he suggests or implies that the difficulty of making constitutional changes in America attaches to all deliberately devised or written systems.

The rigidity of the American constitution is the only feature of it upon which Professor Pollard touches. Yet if it was his

aim to draw a fair and a scientific contrast between the merits of evolution and design in the development of institutions, there are certain other aspects of the American system which he might perhaps have noted. One is that, in spite of its extreme (and quite unnecessary) rigidity, it has worked tolerably well for more than a century, and holds together in peace and prosperity one of the most populous and highly developed communities in the world; if it was not able to prevent a civil war, neither was the British system in the seventeenth century. Another is that it did actually bring about the political union of thirteen distinct States, very jealous of their independence. These are surely facts which have a material bearing upon the question whether "human design" is of any avail in constitutional matters; they ought not to be passed over without a word. "We cannot fuse States into one by statute," says Professor Pollard. But the Americans did it; the Australians, Canadians and South Africans did it; Bismarck did it; even our own ancestors did it in the Acts of Union. And one wonders what would have happened to the American colonies after 1782 if their citizens had decided simply to wait until they somehow grew together, persuading themselves, as Professor Pollard wants us to persuade ourselves, that "formal unity may come about in course of time, but not because we strive to create it."

There is another American analogy to which Professor Pollard alludes; it is even more directly apposite to the present position of the British Empire. In 1763 the first British Empire emerged from a great war, in which all its members had fought for a common cause. The war had emphasised certain defects in the system of the Empire, which had already made relations difficult, and which (but for the French danger) would long before have produced acute friction. A reorganisation of the Imperial system seemed to be, and was, necessary. George III. and his Ministers saw this and made an attempt to create a new system, or rather to revise and reorganise the old. Their mistaken proposals intensified the earlier difficulties, and led to the dissolution of the Empire. But the fact that they did not find the right solution does not imply that no solution should have been sought. The problem was a new one: it was the problem of combining unity with freedom. The American colonies had a large degree of self-government, but they were realising (quite apart from anything that George III. and his Ministers did) that their self-government had limits. And as it is the inevitable tendency of self-governing institutions to strive for their own fulfilment, the

partnership was bound to break up unless the existing restrictions on American self-government could be somehow removed without severing the Imperial tie. The nineteenth century found a solution for this problem; the eighteenth century failed to do so. Part of the reason for this failure was that during the generation before 1763 responsible statesmen, both in England and in America, had given no thought to the problem. They were content to follow Professor Pollard's method and let things drift. The Whig colonial policy was that of "not reading the American dispatches," and the Whigs blamed George Grenville for all the trouble because—too late and in too great a hurry, and without the aid of a body of well-informed opinion—he tried for the first time to study the question. His scheme was the wrong scheme. But no scheme at all—which would have implied the retention, in a slipshod way, of all the old restrictions on colonial self-government—was certain to be, in the long run, equally fatal. "The Empire," Professor Pollard tells us, "was not reft in twain in the eighteenth century because we let things drift." But if I have any understanding of the matter that is precisely why it *was* reft in twain—because people declined to face a great problem of statesmanship until it was too late, and cozened themselves into the belief that they could trust to the genius of the British system, and that all would be well if they only did nothing in particular.

The circumstances of 1763 are reproducing themselves with remarkable exactitude to-day. Once more a great war is being fought by the partner-nations of the Empire. Once more the strain of war is emphasising defects in the Imperial system which had caused some trouble earlier, though then they did not appear very important. These defects are, mainly, two, and both involve a restriction upon self-government. On the one hand, the Colonies realise that they have no share in the direction of foreign policy, which, as they now realise, vitally affects them. On the other hand, they realise the significance and importance of Imperial defence, in which also they have no say. Now, as in 1763, the irresistible tendency of self-governing institutions to strive after their own fulfilment is bound to show itself—especially if the German danger is removed as completely as the French danger was removed in 1763. Once more a problem of statesmanship lies before us which *cannot* be solved, any more than the problem of 1763 could be solved, merely by doing nothing in particular.

I am not arguing in favour of any particular solution of the

problem, which is far more complex than that of 1763: I am only endeavouring to show that some answer has to be given to it, and that almost the worst answer is that of doing nothing in particular. If we find any solution it will have to be as little rigid and as capable of adaptation as possible. But at least let us realise that the achievements of our forefathers were not based upon a vague trust in evolution. They were based upon a positive belief in freedom, which was expressed in a succession of deliberate if cautious endeavours to face each new problem as it arose, and to recast their institutions sufficiently to enable them to deal with it. The greatest of their failures was due, not to the fact that they faced the problem, but that they put it off too long, and when at last it forced itself upon them, did not deal with it frankly enough or with sufficient knowledge, intelligence, and insight.

RAMSAY MUIR.

II.—By D. O. Malcolm.

Professor Pollard's Creighton Lecture, printed in the October number of History, is described by its author as a discussion of the bearing of an "antithesis between growth and manufacture upon the past and future of our Parliamentary institutions." In effect, it is an attack on the conclusion arrived at by Mr. Lionel Curtis in his recently published works, "The Problem of the Commonwealth" and "The Commonwealth of Nations" (Part I.), which conclusion may for my present purpose be summarised in the proposition that the problem of Imperial Federation is the really pressing constitutional problem of our day, and that now is the acceptable time when the leaders of public opinion in all the self-governing parts of the Empire should prepare to sit down together to formulate a definite plan for its solution. It is true that Professor Pollard does not mention Mr. Curtis or his books by name, but he takes as his text, for the purpose of refuting it, the phrase: "Human institutions do not grow; they are made by human will for the realisation of human purposes," quoted from the review of "The Problem of the Commonwealth" in *The Times* Literary Supplement of May 25th last; and it is in the light of an attack upon a doctrine at once true and vitally important that Professor Pollard's lecture presents itself to one whose agreement, in all essentials, with Mr. Curtis's views is as profound as his admiration of the lofty vigour and sincerity with which they are stated.

I shall not venture, *impar congressus Achilli*, to dispute with a man of Professor Pollard's great learning about the history of the jury system or the development of Parliament from a court of law into a sovereign legislature, nor will I follow him into the discussion of the secular problem of free will and determinism, whither one passage of his lecture might tempt a philosopher. But I do venture very respectfully to suggest that Professor Pollard's brilliant discourse is based on a false antithesis, and that we shall do well not to allow the brilliance to blind us to the falsity. We are asked to consider whether Parliamentary institutions "grow" or are "manufactured": we are told that "the issue is one between human design and evolution." Metaphors are dangerous things, and it will not be out of place to ask ourselves what these metaphors of growth and manufacture mean and what we are to understand, in this connection, by that convenient word "evolution." In the sense in which Professor Pollard uses the words I apprehend that a human institution, such as a Parliament, is an instance of "growth" or "evolution" if it has come to be what it is without any effort of will, without any conscious adaptation of means to ends by any human being throughout its history: it is an instance of "design" or "manufacture" if it has been suddenly created out of nothing, and without any felt or expressed need for it on the part of a community, by superior persons whose inner consciousness told them that it would be good for the community to have it. If that be what the words mean I should doubt whether history affords any instance of pure "growth" or pure "manufacture" either, while if the development of every institution worth having has, as one would gather from Professor Pollard, been that of the celebrated Topsy who, when asked to account for her existence, replied, "'Specs I growed," the study of the political institutions of the past as a guide to political action in the future seems to be robbed of most of its value. But when people speak of institutions having grown they do not usually mean that they are the mere product of a fortuitous concourse of atomic human actions. They are more like the habits of an individual, the accumulated result of a series of particular actions, each consciously directed to a similar particular end. The liberty of the subject may have been won by means of a long series of successful individual acts of resistance to oppression, but that is not the end of the matter. The time came when it was expedient to "make" law—to "manufacture" it, if you will, though Professor Pollard uses the word almost as a term of reproach—by writing

down on parchment, in a document called 'Magna Carta,' precisely what the liberty of the subject was to mean. If we use the words in this sense we shall probably agree that well-nigh all political institutions are the result both of "growth" and of law-making. The need for them comes gradually; the desire for them is felt more and more clearly, slowly, it may be, or quickly, by an increasing number of people, until at last they are "made" by positive laws. There is no antithesis in the sense of opposition between the two elements in what is essentially one process. We might as well say that there is an antithesis between love and marriage, or urge that because the union of man and woman is as old as the Garden of Eden there is no need of marriage laws. It is true that when we look at the constitutional history of a single people, especially if that people be the people of England, it is the element of growth rather than the element of positive law-making that commands our attention. It is true, for instance, that the functions and powers of our Parliament have so developed themselves throughout the ages without any statute having been passed for the purpose that its mediæval mother would fail to recognise it; but even our Parliament has had to have the mutual relations of its two Houses precisely defined by statute in the Parliament Act of 1911; successive Reform Acts have defined how Parliaments are to be elected; and Professor Pollard himself points out that "some unknown political genius who almost deserves the title of founder of the House of Commons" invented in the reign of Edward II. the practice of pooling common grievances, embodying them in a common petition, and backing that petition with the House's united powers of taxation. It was not then, after all, by an unconscious process of "evolution" that the House of Commons "grew" into the habit of pooling its grievances. Here is a clear instance of "human design," none the less real by reason of the fact that the design needed no statute to carry it out and that the name of the designer has been forgotten.

And when we turn from the contemplation of the internal constitutional development of England to the study, peculiarly interesting to those who aspire to a real Imperial Federation, of the processes by which unions have been effected between States previously disunited, we shall find the element of positive law-making or "manufacture" emphasised with special clearness. This must be so in the nature of things. You cannot unite two or more bodies previously separate without thinking out clearly beforehand and laying down in precise language the terms and

conditions of the union. Partnership involves not only common interests, but a deed of partnership. Marriage involves, amongst other things, the entering into a solemn legal contract and, usually, the drawing up of marriage settlements. Voluntary union between separate States involves an organic law in some form. The converse of this proposition is equally true: you cannot disunite that which is united without somehow having it laid down on what terms the disunion is to take place; and a convinced Home Ruler might be pardoned for expressing some resentment if he were told that he must wait for Irish self-government to "grow," and that the last thing he must do is to draft and attempt to secure the passage of a Home Rule Bill.

It is by no means true that the terms on which separate States are to unite must be laid down in a law like the law of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not. Common sense and historical experience alike point to a reasonable degree of elasticity so that constitutions may be modified to meet changing circumstances, as even the American Constitution, perhaps the most rigid of all written constitutions, has been. States which aspire to unite with one another are not called upon to choose between abandoning their aspirations or binding themselves to live for ever under the dead hand of an unchangeable document. But it is true, nevertheless, that unions or federations necessarily involve written law of some kind, and that no true organic union of the British Empire will take place unless someone will be at the pains to make a definite plan for it. It is true, again, that it is idle to make plans for unions or federations until the conscious need for them has "grown," as Professor Pollard would say, until men have come to see that they must unite if they are to be strong or to rise to the height of their responsibilities—until, in the common phrase, public opinion is ripe. But this is no criticism upon an author who seeks to point out to his fellow-citizens where the path of duty and of safety lies, and to influence public opinion in the right direction, or who, believing that he sees one of the great tides in the affairs of men, calls upon our statesmen to take it at the flood.

Let us look at Professor Pollard's own instances of his alleged antithesis between "growth" and "manufacture." "An Imperial Parliament," he tells us, "may be the outcome of this war; but the war was none of our making, and the British Empire might thus owe its unification to the German Emperor. That assuredly was not his intention." Certainly not; but, if this passage is to be taken seriously at all, we may reply that

it may well be that the war forced upon us by Germany is proving to the British peoples more potently than a thousand political discourses could do that they must unite if they are to prevent the recurrence of such a catastrophe; but that a conscious effort of constitution-making will still be called for if the fruits of the terrible lesson are not to be lost. And the passage which I have quoted prompts the inquiry: "What of the union of the German Empire itself?" Was not that union, achieved through the wars of 1864 to 1871, the result of conscious human design coldly and deliberately carried out by the brutal instruments of blood and iron? Happily there are other instruments available for civilised peoples.

Other instruments indeed have been used by the people of the United Kingdom, and when Professor Pollard deals with the Union between England and Scotland in 1707, on which Mr. Curtis rightly lays great stress, he admits that it is a case in which "men have apparently succeeded in forestalling the process of growth and in consciously making a durable constitution." But he qualifies this admission by claiming that "it is a legal rather than an historical view which regards that Union as the product of a single creative Act passed in 1707," and by pointing to previous unsuccessful attempts to effect the Union of the two kingdoms. And when he comes to the Irish Union he cheerfully affirms that it was "made and did not grow," apparently on the sole ground that its results have been, in his judgment, unsatisfactory. At this stage one begins to suspect that Professor Pollard's main proposition could be more accurately stated by inverting it: it is not so much that he approves of institutions that "grow" and disapproves of those that are "made," as that those institutions have "grown" which he happens to approve and those have been "made" of which he happens to disapprove. For really, in this matter of growth *versus* manufacture, no distinction can be drawn between the Union with Scotland and the Union with Ireland. Scotland throughout her history had been an ill-neighbour to England, at least as much as Ireland had. So far was she from having developed a system of common law identical with that of England that her system of common law remains different to-day. So far was she from having grown closely akin to England in economic interests, in national feeling and sympathy, that Union was adopted just after a fierce quarrel, arising mainly from economic causes, which had brought the two nations to the brink of war. Union was, indeed, the only alternative to civil war; and the same Act of the English

Parliament which empowered Queen Anne to appoint commissioners to treat for Union with the Scots also declared [1] that unless the Scottish succession was settled by Christmas Day, 1705, Scotsmen were to be held as aliens and incapable of inheriting lands, that no arms or horses were to be exported to Scotland, and that no Scottish cattle, linen or coals were to be imported into England. Yet the Union of England and Scotland has been an unqualified success. Professor Pollard, indeed, tells us that "the real Union between the two realms grew after the Act through the decline of theological animus, the unifying effects of the industrial revolution, of the common inheritance of dominions and oversea trade, and of the common development of responsible self-government which Scotland had never enjoyed before 1707." But the real Union, which grew *after* the Act, may well have grown largely *on account of* it. The Act which made the two kingdoms one was an indispensable condition precedent to their having any common inheritance or common development; and without the Act, as Mr. Curtis shows, Scotland could only have enjoyed responsible government if she had undone the union of the crowns and become for all purposes a separate sovereign State.

The Union with Ireland, like the Union with Scotland, was adopted at a moment of grave national emergency and as the only alternative to intolerable evils. "On the morrow of such carnage as Ireland had seen (*sc.* in the Rebellion of 1798) and of such peril as the whole Commonwealth had sustained, what justification could Pitt have for continuing to accept a system under which Government in Ireland had always to choose between the opposition of Parliament, and the purchase of a majority by corruption at the cost of Ireland itself? Its loaded gibbets and smoking ruins were sufficient proof of some radical defect in its system of government. Obviously, some change was necessary. What was the nature of the change to be? The only alternative to a system in which the executive controlled Parliament was one in which Parliament could control the Executive. But what constituencies in Ireland were to control Parliament? Was Pitt to place that control in the hands of a minority still thirsting for Catholic blood? Or, if not, was he to entrust it to the majority, which included the United Irishmen and Catholics, from whose hands the pike and torch had just been

[1] *The Commonwealth of Nations*, p. 289. See on this whole subject Mr. Curtis's admirable chapters on the "Inclusion of Scotland in the British Commonwealth" and on "Ireland and the British Commonwealth," Chaps. v and vii.

torn? Such alternatives had only to be stated in order to be dismissed, and, these dismissed, no other expedient remained than to go back to the point where Cromwell had begun, by abolishing the Parliament at Dublin and giving Ireland, like Scotland, representatives in a common Parliament at Westminster."[1]

If indeed the Union with Ireland has been unsuccessful, the cause is to be sought not in the fact that the Union was "made" in 1800, but in the failure to redeem in time English promises of Catholic emancipation, and in agrarian grievances too long unredressed. And before we condemn the Union of 1800 it behoves us to reflect to what evils the people of these islands would have been exposed if it had not taken place. The critic who blames Pitt for not waiting with folded hands on the easy process of "evolution" should face, as he had to face, the problem of whither a course of inaction would lead.

The refusal to consider what alternative courses were open mars Professor Pollard's treatment of the drawing up of the Constitution of the United States. He almost seems to condemn it for being a written Constitution, but he ignores the fact that the thirteen States after 1783 were only, and could only be, saved from chaos, bankruptcy, and eventual reconquest by Union. A sentiment of common brotherhood had by no means "grown" among them. "Power, prosperity, and consideration," writes the biographer of Alexander Hamilton, "which all men affected to desire, were only to be had on terms which the States could not bring themselves to pay. . . . The thirteen States proceeded to indulge themselves in the costly luxury of an internecine tariff war. The States with seaports preyed upon their land-locked brethren, and provoked a boycott in return. Pennsylvania attacked Delaware, Connecticut was oppressed by Rhode Island and New York. New Jersey, lying between New York on the one hand and Pennsylvania on the other, was compared to 'a cask tapped at both ends,' North Carolina, between South Carolina and Virginia, to 'a patient bleeding at both stumps.' It was a dangerous game, ruinous in itself, and, behind the custom-house officers, men were beginning to furbish up the locks of their muskets."[2] Union was the only cure for these evils, but, if Union was to come about, the terms on which a new common sovereignty was to be created had to be written down. What other course was open? It is true that the Constitution of the United States was not a perfect document. It is true that the

[1] *Commonwealth of Nations*, pp. 513–514.

[2] F. S. Oliver, *Life of Alexander Hamilton*, pp. 134–135.

bloodiest of all civil wars had to be fought before it was finally decided whether the United States or the several "States" themselves were the ultimate repository of sovereignty. But this is mainly due to the fact that the real fathers of the American Constitution, Washington and Hamilton, were not able to prevail upon their colleagues at the Philadelphia Convention to accept in its entirety their plan of union which would have left no doubt upon the matter. It affords no ground for thinking that they were ill-advised in believing that the only hope of political salvation for their countrymen lay in Union, or in seeking to achieve it by the only means by which it could have been achieved—the assembly of a Convention to consider definite plans for it. And who would not prefer the Union of North America as it stands to-day, even with the history of the Civil War behind it, to the jangling discord of the separate Republics of Central and South America? For the rest, Professor Pollard's criticisms of the American Constitution amount to no more than this: that it is inexpedient so to draw a written constitution that it is exceedingly difficult to alter it. There is much truth in this judgment; but it is not of the essence of written constitutions that they should be exceedingly difficult to alter—witness, for example, the South African Constitution—and it remains true that it is not possible peacefully to unite States previously separate without reducing the terms of the union to writing. Should a real Imperial Federation happily come about it will presumably be effected by an Act of the Imperial Parliament. It will not be necessary—it may very likely not be possible—for that Parliament to deprive itself or its successors of the power of amending it by subsequent legislation, in which case it will not be open to anyone to complain of the Imperial Constitution on the ground of over-rigidity; but the Imperial Constitution will be a written one for all that, set forth in the express terms of an Act of Parliament deliberately "made."

Professor Pollard again lays stress on his antithesis between growth and manufacture when he treats of our self-governing Dominions. "Responsible self-government," he says, "is itself a matter of growth, and you may search the laws of the Empire in vain for a statute to the effect that any British realm shall be governed by Ministers responsible to an elected legislature." This is literally true, but it ought to be added that the Royal Instructions to the Governors or Governors-General of all the self-governing dominions invariably order them to be guided by the advice of their Ministers in the exercise of the powers of

sovereignty nominally delegated to them. These Royal Instructions are legal documents issued by the King under the sign-manual and signet. They lay down with precision the doctrine of responsible government, and the distinction between them and statutes is, for our present purpose, hardly more than formal. The first issue of Royal Instructions of the type described marked a real and vitally important change in the relations between the United Kingdom and the Dominions, a change made deliberately and of set purpose by Queen Victoria's Government. Indeed, in his treatment of this question of Dominion self-government Professor Pollard, if it may be said without offence, goes astray to a degree that would hardly have been possible in an historian of his eminence if he had not set out to defend a thesis of automatic "growth." The rebellions of 1837–8 were certainly evidence that some definite step was required to provide for the better government of Canada, and the failure of the union of Upper and Lower Canada, effected on Lord Durham's recommendation, was as much due to the need for a union or federation of all the provinces of British North America as it was to the need for separate provincial legislatures for the French and British populations of Quebec and Ontario respectively.[1] Upper and Lower Canada recovered their separate legislatures in 1867 certainly, but not legislatures with the powers of those that existed before 1840. What they "recovered" were separate provincial legislatures to deal with local provincial affairs alone, and this only as a part of a general scheme of Federation, just as much "made" and as much effected by a written law as the union of Upper and Lower Canada had been, whereby the power of dealing with all affairs common to the whole of Canada was vested in a new Dominion Parliament created by the British North America Act. As for the introduction of responsible government, I hope I have already shown that it cannot be claimed as an instance of pure "growth." Durham explained in his Report that the root of the trouble throughout British North America lay in the fact that the people of the colonies, while they could take their part in framing their own laws by

[1] Durham himself desired a general union, and only did not recommend the immediate adoption of this plan by the Imperial Government first, because it was desirable to wait until it had been discussed and accepted by the various provincial legislatures, and, secondly, because something was required immediately to deal with the situation in Upper and Lower Canada. He recommended that the Bill to unite Upper and Lower Canada should contain provisions "by which any or all of the other North American colonies may . . . be . . . admitted into the Union."—*Durham Report*, Lucas' Edition, Vol. II., p. 323.

means of their representative legislative assemblies, could take no part at all in controlling the administration of those laws, which rested with an executive responsible only to the Colonial Secretary in England. Henceforth, therefore, the Imperial Government had to make a clear choice between controlling the local administration of the colonies from Downing Street or allowing it to be controlled by the colonists themselves. For a few years British Ministers and Governors tried to compromise; but the choice was finally made when, in 1846–7, Lord Grey instructed Sir John Harvey to adopt in Nova Scotia without delay "that system of parliamentary Government which has long prevailed in the Mother Country," or, in other words, that "the direction of the internal policy of the colony should be entrusted to those who enjoy the confidence of the Provincial Parliament." [1] It may surely be argued, then, that the establishment of responsible government in British North America was the result of a deliberate act of will, that in this sense it was "made," and that it was effected by means of a written document.

When he turns to the federation of the six Australian States and the union of the four South African colonies Professor Pollard admits that separate States can federate or unite and "make" a constitution for themselves without waiting for the slow and haphazard process of "growth," but only, apparently, if they have grown closely alike to one another in social development, economic needs, and political circumstances. We have seen that these conditions were not present in the case of the Union of England and Scotland or in that of the American Union, and it is a strange reading of the history of the South African Union, at least in its economic aspect, to suggest that they were present in that case either. The danger of the situation existing in South Africa in 1907–8 lay precisely in this, that the economic needs and interests of the separate South African colonies were so dissimilar, so conflicting, that in the absence of any single authority capable of deciding from day to day between the contending forces there was real risk lest the same internecine quarrels which in 1895 had led to the closing of the Vaal River drifts by President Kruger and to the brink of war should break out again in all their old acuteness. The interests of the Cape Colony were in the main agrarian and protectionist, the interests of the Witwatersrand, the great mining and industrial centre of the country, lay in the direction of free trade. The object of the Cape and Natal railway systems was to secure

[1] Earl Grey to Lieut.-Governor Sir John Harvey. March 31, 1847.

for themselves the through traffic to the Witwatersrand and to levy such rates on it as amounted, in effect, to taxes on the inland consumer. The interests of the Transvaal lay in bringing in as much as possible of its traffic through the Portuguese port of Delagoa Bay. Conference after conference of the separate colonies met to endeavour to arrive at customs and railway agreements, and failed to achieve anything but makeshifts which settled nothing. The friction arising out of these questions, insoluble in the absence of a single authority to solve them, was generating a dangerous heat, and it was the recognised necessity of adopting the only remedy open to them which, more than anything else, led the foremost politicians of South Africa to meet one another in the Union Convention of 1908–9.

They met there in a spirit of compromise and mutual give and take. Between them they hammered out the text of a written Union Constitution. They secured its approval by the legislatures of the several colonies and its manufacture into positive law by an Act of the Imperial Parliament. And thus they provided themselves with a Constitution which, whatever may be its defects, has stood the strain of the fiercest industrial disturbance, of foreign war, and of armed rebellion.

It is not true to say, as Professor Pollard does, that there was no great disproportion in size or population between the South African colonies. The white population of Natal was about one-sixth of that of the Cape Colony; it bore, therefore, about the same relation to it as the population of Canada does to that of the United Kingdom to-day. The point would not be one of much importance were it not that it illustrates what I shall venture to call the fallacy of absorption. "It is easy enough to unite," says Professor Pollard, "when union means equality, but men do not like predominant partners." Equality presupposes two or more equals in themselves separate—partners in a business, for example. But Union does not mean equality, it means union: not the "co-operation" of two or more separate States which remain separate, but the recognition by the individuals composing those States that they are citizens not of two or more commonwealths, but of one, and that it is to that commonwealth that their ultimate allegiance is due. The populations of Scotland and Ireland are each about one-ninth of that of England. That does not mean that England is the "predominant partner" and that Scotland and Ireland have no choice but to do as they are told. The United Kingdom is one: the majority of the United Kingdom, however it may be composed,

binds the minority; and it is probable that many of the legislative proposals of recent years would have met with a very different reception had they been proposed to a Parliament representing English constituencies alone. No valid objection to Imperial Federation can be based on the fact that the white populations of the self-governing Dominions amount to somewhat less than one-third of that of the United Kingdom.

But if the metaphor of separate partners in a business is misleading, much more so would be that of the boa constrictor and the rabbit. This homely figure would be appropriate to one who were to suggest that we should have "an *auto-da-fé* of British Parliaments" or that the Dominions should "submit their domestic politics, their right of taxing themselves, of fixing their own economic and social, educational, and ecclesiastical policy to the arbitrament of a centralised Parliament in which they would all be outvoted." But who has suggested anything of the kind? Nobody proposes to abolish the Dominion Parliaments or to limit in any respect their freedom to deal as they please with their own local affairs : and this is all the freedom that they have to-day. What is proposed is that the people of the Dominions should take a new step forward in freedom and self-government by assuming, for the first time, their fair share—the same share as is taken by the citizens of the United Kingdom—in the responsibility and the burden of determining the issues of peace and war and of conducting those great affairs, such as the government of the Dependencies, which are the common concern of the Empire as a whole. No surrender of local autonomy would be involved in such a step. What is involved in it is the recognition that the Empire is one world-State : not a highly centralised State like Prussia, but a commonwealth of nations, in which a Canadian, an Australian, or a South African may enjoy the fullest rights and bear all the burdens of citizenship without any surrender of his Canadian, Australian, or South African nationality, just as Scotsmen and Irishmen enjoy those rights and bear those burdens to-day while maintaining their Scottish or Irish nationality unimpaired. This step does involve the setting up of an Imperial Parliament to deal with those strictly Imperial affairs in which the people of the Dominions have at present no say at all. In such a Parliament a citizen of any one of the Dominions would have just the same measure of representation as a citizen of the United Kingdom, and the Imperial Government would be responsible to it as it is to-day to a Parliament representative only of the citizens of the United Kingdom. To

suppose that members of such an Imperial Parliament would necessarily or even probably think and vote as delegates from this or that State, instead of as representatives of the citizens of a commonwealth essentially one, is to negate the idea of union, to neglect the binding force of common institutions, and to turn one's back on the experience of the British federal Parliaments already existing. It matters comparatively little in the Dominion Parliament in Canada whether a member comes from Ontario or Nova Scotia, or in the Union Parliament in South Africa whether a member comes from the Cape or the Transvaal. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Sir Robert Borden have followers from all the provinces of Canada : in South Africa what matters is whether a member supports General Botha, Sir Thomas Smartt, or General Hertzog.

There should, then, be no question in a real Imperial Parliament of "Dominion representatives" as such imposing conscription upon "us," or *vice versa*. In the Imperial, as in other Parliaments, a majority, however composed, would bind a minority. The Parliament might even, in its wisdom, enact that conscription should be applied to one part of the Empire and not to another. Such an anomaly would, according to Professor Pollard, be impossible under a single Imperial Parliament, but the "impossibility" is one that has recently occurred in the United Kingdom itself through the omission by Parliament of Ireland from the scope of the Military Service Act.

Professor Pollard does seem to feel that something must be done to give the people of the Dominions their share in the control of the issues of peace and war, but his condemnation of all proposals for organic federation leaves him little space for constructive proposals of his own. It would be unreasonable to complain of this in an author whose main doctrine it is that institutions must grow of themselves; and he does go so far as to tell us that the "point can be met without recourse to a constitutional revolution," and to indicate that he would meet it by developing the practice of summoning Dominion statesmen to attend meetings of the British Cabinet, or by instituting the novel procedure of summoning them by special writ to the House of Lords, which House, he suggests, "might be made a proper chamber for the discussion and control of Imperial foreign policy."

The first of these suggestions is open to all the objections which have frequently been urged, and by no one with greater force than by Mr. Curtis, against schemes based on the idea of

"co-operation" between separate authorities. The Government of the United Kingdom might, if it saw fit (it may to-day), invite to its counsels upon Imperial affairs members of the Dominion Ministries. In cases where decisions of the utmost moment had to be taken quickly time would probably not allow of such consultation. It certainly did not allow of it at the beginning of August, 1914. But even if time did allow of consultation, the Government of the United Kingdom responsible to a Parliament elected on a host of issues, domestic as well as Imperial, and able to look to that Parliament alone for the means of carrying out their policy, could not allow to Dominion Ministers, responsible to other Parliaments elected on the domestic issues of the Dominions, any but a purely advisory voice. They could not in any way share their responsibility with them, and no amount of consultation would long avail to conceal the truth that the issues of peace and war remained solely in the hands of the Government of the United Kingdom.

The alternative suggestion, which involves the reconstruction of the House of Lords, comes as something of a shock. Certainly there would be no difficulty in summoning Dominion statesmen to the House of Lords, but if their voice in that House is to be merely advisory, or if the voice of that House itself is to remain merely advisory, as it has practically become, we are no nearer to giving to the people of the Dominions a share in the control of the issues of peace and war. If we are to reach a solution of the problem by this road we must not only allot to persons summoned from the Dominions a due proportion of the membership of our reconstituted House of Lords: we must somehow convey to that House the power of making and unmaking the Executive. If it is to be "made" a Chamber not only for the discussion, but for the *control* of foreign policy, the Ministry which determines foreign policy must be responsible to it. But to make the Ministry responsible to the hereditary or nominated instead of to the elected House would be to make a constitutional revolution beside which the carrying out of any plan of Imperial Federation that has ever been seriously proposed would be a simple task. Professor Pollard, it is to be presumed, would shrink from such a revolution; but even if it had been effected we should still be faced with the difficulty that the Executive—which could be unmade by a portion of the House of Lords, converted from a minority into a majority by the votes of Dominion members—was the Executive charged not only with the conduct of Imperial affairs, with which alone the Dominion

members would be concerned, but also with the conduct of the domestic affairs of the United Kingdom, which would be no concern of the Dominion members. The adverse vote of the Dominion members might have the result of depriving the people of the United Kingdom of the Executive which from their own domestic point of view they wished to have; yet no one suggests that members from the United Kingdom should have a corresponding power in relation to Dominion Executives. A glance at the history of three successive Irish Home Rule Bills will show that this is no imaginary or purely logical difficulty, but a very real and practical one.

The truth of the matter is that in the last resort there are but two courses open to the people of the Dominions if they are not to continue—and, indeed, they cannot continue indefinitely—to have their foreign affairs managed and their issues of peace and war determined by persons over whom, though they may sometimes be able to influence them, they have no control. These two courses are formal separation from and independence of the Mother Country, the course adopted by the American colonies at the end of the eighteenth century, and organic union, the course adopted by Scotland at the beginning of it. If, as the events of the present war give good ground for thinking, the course of separation may be dismissed, we are left with the sounder and nobler course. It may be that the time is not yet ripe for its adoption, though events and opinions move rapidly in these strenuous days. It may be that the minds of men are not yet prepared for the catastrophic change involved in the passage from disunion to union. The more reason for writings such as those of Mr. Curtis, which call upon our fellow-countrymen throughout the Empire to look the facts of their true position in the face, for opinion and conviction are truly matters of development and growth.

But let us be clear that the change, when it is made, will be a catastrophic change. Between disunion and union there is a great gulf fixed, and a great gulf is not a thing that can be crossed by imperceptible steps. And if we believe that the time approaches when men will be prepared for the change, let us not be deterred by analogies drawn from the constitutional development of a single nation, such as the English, from the formulation and discussion of definite plans for disentangling the conduct of affairs common to the whole Empire from the conduct of the domestic affairs of the United Kingdom, and for giving to every responsible citizen of the Empire his due share

of the power of controlling the Imperial Government and of the burden of defraying its cost. Let us not be misled by the too facile metaphors of growth and evolution into a belief that Imperial Union will come of itself in its own good time, as a mist rises from the sea. It is not in that spirit that Washington and Hamilton in America, Macdonald and Brown in Canada, Barton and Reid in Australia, Botha and Jameson in South Africa united their divided countries. No man could by taking thought create the conditions of public opinion and opportunity necessary to the successful achievement of Imperial Union, but the most favourable conditions will be of no avail, the most golden opportunities will be allowed to slip, unless men are found, as in the case of every other peaceful union of nations they have been found, ready to sit down calmly and agree to a document setting forth precisely what Union is to mean, so that their fellow-citizens, if they adopt it, may adopt it knowing fully what they are doing and having counted the cost. To prepare such a document is the proper task of an Imperial Convention. The decision to adopt or reject it must rest with the electorates of the Empire; but should they decide to leap over the gulf which separates them from Union, their leap, if the work of the Imperial Convention has been faithfully done, will not be a leap in the dark.

D. O. MALCOLM.

MILITARY SERVICE IN A FLEMISH COMMUNE.

Bruges, 1288–1480.

One of the most interesting examples of mediæval military service may be seen in the communal militia of the Flemish towns. It was, of course, quite usual for towns to raise bodies of soldiers in times of need, but few could provide such large and well-equipped forces as the cities of Flanders. Enriched by trade, they were very powerful; at their head stood Bruges, Ghent, and Ypres, and under them were grouped the lesser communes which followed their leaders to battle. The men of the Franc, a district which included Dixmude, Damme, Ostend, Blankenberghe, and other places whose names are familiar to us, marched with the citizens of Bruges. Records dating from 1288 to 1480, preserved there, and happily rendered accessible by the work of M. Gilliodts van Severen,[1] give valuable information as to the resources of that city, and also throw light upon the conditions of Mediæval warfare.

In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the Flemish communes were exempted by charter from military service beyond the frontier, but they were all liable for it if either their country, or the person of their ruler, were in danger.[2] The forces of Bruges were wonderfully complete. The cavalry was drawn from the richest of the citizens, those possessing property worth "300 livres" or more, and rules for its organisation were laid down in 1292.[3] At that time the number employed was small, only two hundred and forty-three,[4] but sometimes neighbouring gentry acted as auxiliaries; thus William of Juliers, Provost of Maestricht, fought for the Flemings at the battle of Courtrai in 1302. When artillery developed, cavalry grew increasingly useful, as the fighting was then at somewhat longer range, and it was necessary to find means of rapidly covering the ground.[5]

[1] *Inventaire des Archives de la Ville de Bruges*, quoted as *A*.

[2] "Générale wapeninghe" ordered by the Duke of Burgundy in 1479. *A*, Vol. VI., 188.

[3] *A*, I., 29 30.

[4] Duclos, Ad., *Bruges* (quoted hereafter as *D*), 136.

[5] *A*, III., 47.

The bulk of the army, however, was infantry, formed of companies of artisans and other of the less wealthy citizens. Towns were divided into sections and quarters, each of which furnished contingents, which had their own petty officers ("dizeniers"), banners, carts, and dépôts of arms.[1] Members of the same gild fought side by side, and sometimes several gilds were grouped together. Members of thirty different trades fought for Bruges at Douai in 1302.[2]

The corps of arbalesters, or crossbowmen, was very distinguished; it was a permanent body from 1297, and at a later date became the gild of St. George and St. Denis. It distinguished itself at Groeninghe.[3] The crossbow was a very different weapon from the longbow; it was not strung by hand like the latter, but by means of a pulley, which the arbalester carried with him. Putting his foot into a stirrup at the bottom, and applying the wheels and lever to the string, he wound it up by a handle at the top, and the "quarrel," as the missile was called, could be thrown a distance of two hundred and twenty yards.[4]

The archers were under the patronage of St. Sebastian; they were very useful, and are frequently mentioned in the records[5]; sometimes they were mounted and sometimes on foot.

In 1846 some frescoes were discovered on a wall of a brewery in Ghent, and M. de Vigne, a Belgian antiquary, reproduced copies of them in his book, *Récherches Historiques sur les Costumes Civils et Militaires des Gildes et des Corporations de Metiers*. He believed that they were painted at the end of the thirteenth or the beginning of the fourteenth century. His pictures are exceedingly interesting, and show how the foot-soldiers of that date were equipped. One group (Plate IV.), probably the Butchers, may be seen marching behind the banner of their gild; they wear mail under coats of arms, ornamented with zig-zag bands alternately red and yellow; their hands are protected by gauntleted gloves and their heads by iron casques, and two of them have shields. Some are armed with pikes, two have battle-axes, one a falchion, and another a kind of pike with a triangular piece of iron forming a hook at the end of it, which was used to drag horsemen from their steeds. The rest have a curious weapon resembling a pike, but not quite so long and rather thicker; it consists of a wooden staff swelling out at the upper end, hooped with iron, and terminating in a sharp point. This M. de Vigne declared to be the "goedendag," the national weapon of the

[1] *D*, 136. [2] *A*, I., 85. [3] *D*, 136–7.
[4] Fairholt, *Costume in England*, 222–3.
[5] *A*, II., 377, 380, 400; III., 519; VI., 79.

Flemings. Much doubt was thrown upon his assertion when he made it, but recently evidence has come to light which corroborates it in a very remarkable manner. On a fourteenth-century chest in the possession of the Warden of New College, Oxford, are some carvings depicting the battle of Courtrai,[1] and the Flemings carry weapons, rather thinner, but obviously of the same construction as those of the Butchers of Ghent. M. de Vigne's theory also agrees with a description of the goedendag in the rhyming chronicles of Guiart, a thirteenth-century writer. It was very simple, but could be very deadly if used skilfully. When cavalry bore down upon the Flemish infantry drawn up in battle array, the foot-soldier, grasping it with both hands, dealt the oncoming horse a tremendous blow, and the rider, unseated, was thrown on to its point, or perhaps fell to the ground, and then the Fleming, recovering himself quickly, transfixed his foe before he had time to get on his feet, hampered as he was with heavy armour.

As time went on changes took place in the Flemish army, and the most important was the employment of artillery. From very early days "engines" were used, but they were not worked by gun-power until the fourteenth century; the arsenal at Bruges was well furnished with "balistes" and "espringales"—huge crossbows mounted on wheels, which were worked by tension and threw great bolts.[2] Unfortunately, the accounts which might have contained the first payments for cannon have been lost, so we do not know exactly when Bruges began to have them; in 1339 it was spending money on "ribaudes," one of the earliest kinds of big guns.[3] It sent some of them, some "donrebussen" (donderbussen, thunder guns), and also a bombard to the siege of Oudenarde,[4] and a passage in Froissart's *Chronicles* shows how such weapons impressed the men of those days. One bombard, he says, was of very great size, fifty feet in length, and shot stones of immense weight. When it was fired it could be heard five leagues off in the day-time and ten at night. The report of it was so loud that it seemed as if all the devils in hell had broken loose. The garrison pulled down all the houses near the walls and covered them with earth as a protection against cannon.[5] Some-

[1] Described and illustrated by Mr. Ffoulkes in *Archæologia*, 2nd ser., Vol. XV., 113, and *seq.*

[2] Both are mentioned, but they seem to have been very much alike. *A*, III., 40; Oman, *Art of War*, 545. Spelling varies a good deal in the Bruges records, and we find springhalen, springael, and springaen, as well as espringal, II., 379, 380; III., 203.

[3] These were called "niewen engienen" in 1340–1, *Ibid.*, cf. III., 39, 45.

[4] *Ibid.*, II., 378. [5] *Froissart*, ed. Johnes, 1839, I., 710.

times guns and cannon were made of fanciful shapes to resemble dragons, serpents, and other animals, and this is the reason why curious names, as, for instance, serpentine [1] and couleuvrine (coulevrine, a snake), were given to them. In 1383 cannon were placed on the ramparts of Bruges and at all points of strategic importance in the city.[2] In 1477–8, when Flanders was at war with Louis XI. of France, Bruges had fifty-one cannon, ninety ribaudequins, three large iron serpentines, ten bronze ones, and fifteen other bronze pieces,[3] but these were not thought sufficient, and shortly afterwards a hundred and twenty-nine couleuvrines, thirty-four "hacbussen," and seventy-four new serpentines were added, and several old pieces were repaired by the bell-founder, Guillaume Gheeraerd.[4] A quantity of munitions was also bought. Before the outbreak of the present war two very good specimens of fifteenth-century cannon were kept in a portico of the Gruuthuse, a mansion which belonged to Louis de Gruuthuse,[5] a nobleman of considerable eminence, and it is quite possible that they may have been amongst those mentioned in the archives, as Louis was at that time Captain of the town and charged with its safe keeping. One of them was a cannon royal of the wrought-iron period, built up of staves of iron, rather like a cask, and hooped with iron rings; it was 70¾ inches long and its bore was 8 inches. The other was of similar construction, but longer and more slender. There was also a mortar, another contrivance for throwing missiles, which was very popular in the second half of the fifteenth century. The police sometimes took charge of the artillery,[6] but there were also specially trained men to look after it. In 1477–8 a certain Etienne de Ligne was "chef de l'artillerie" and had four masters of artillery, two assistants, twenty artillerymen, two carpenters, and fifty-one other men under him[7]; and from 1435 contingents of coulevriniers appear.[8]

A corps of pikemen seems to have been constituted between 1467 and 1477, and about the latter date a hundred pikes, twenty feet long, and two hundred and fourteen feet long were bought for them.[9] From time to time bodies of volunteers were raised; they were known as "les chaperons rouges," from the colour of their caps,[10] and it was considered a great honour to belong to them. Foreign mercenaries, professional soldiers, often supplemented

[1] *A*, VI., 168. [2] *Ibid.*, III., 35. [3] *A.*, VI., 169.

[4] M. G. van Severen uses the word "refond," but as far as we know cannon were not cast at this early date. *Ibid.*, VI., 177–8.

[5] Our Edward IV. was entertained at the Gruuthuse by its owner when he fled to Flanders in 1470.

[6] *D.*, 137. [7] *A*, VI., 168. [8] *D*, 137; *A*, VI., 79, 169.

[9] *A*, VI., 169. [10] *A*, II., 375, 377, 401.

the Flemish forces; during the great struggle against France in 1302 Bruges had Dutch, German, and English companies in her pay, some cavalry, some infantry, and some arbalesters.[1]

Besides the actual fighting men there were others whose work was very necessary; carpenters accompanied the forces to construct pontoons and anything else that was needed; bowyers made arrows on the spot, and there were plenty of cooks to manage the commissariat.[2] The services of messengers were frequently wanted,[3] and we also read of "gardiens des luminaires,"[4] probably men who carried lanterns and torches to give light at night. The value of inspiring military music was well understood, and musicians—trumpeters, buglers, and pipers—are often mentioned.[5] The sick and wounded were tended by surgeons assisted by servants from the Hospital of St. John. The town doctor, who received an annual pension, accompanied the army on its expeditions, and payments for medicines and ointments are entered on the account rolls.[6] Chaplains, generally members of one of the religious Orders, cared for the spiritual welfare of the soldiers, and in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries a large tent, beautifully decorated and provided with an altar and a statue of the Virgin, served as a chapel.[7]

The feeding of the troops was no light matter; sometimes they were billeted, and allowances were made to the householders who received them,[8] but often the town itself supplied their food, and we have some interesting details as to their rations. Bread for the army at Courtrai was furnished partly by the Bailiff of Flanders and partly by the abbeys in the district round Furnes and the environs of Ghent, and a great deal of wheat was made into bread on the spot.[9] The expenses of the kitchen of William of Juliers, during his stay in Flanders from May 23rd to August 6th, 1302, include payments for meat, poultry, eggs, pâtés, pot-herbs, mustard, and fish of many kinds—plaice, mackerel, herrings, butt, and even Scotch salmon.[10] Men sent to besiege Ghent, on another occasion, were also very well fed; they had beef, mutton, goat, ham, capons, fowl, stockfish, herrings, and other fish. Spices, dates, ginger, saffron, sugar and sweetmeats were bought from the apothecary[11]; some of them were used for medicinal purposes, and some to flavour or supplement the heavier food. In addition, large quantities of bread and beer were provided for them.[12]

[1] *D*, 140. [2] *Ibid.*, 141. [3] *A*, II., 375; III., 205. [4] *Ibid.*, II., 401.
[5] *A*, II., 375, 380, 401; VI., 168. [6] *Ibid.*, I., 332; II., 379, 391, 400.
[7] *Ibid.*, II., 375, 384; IV., 109; V., 120. [8] *Ibid.*, I., 103, 104.
[9] *Ibid.*, I., 138, 142. [10] *Ibid.* I., 113 and *seq.*
[11] *Ibid.*, II., 396 and *seq.* [12] *A*, II., 396.

The baggage train was considerable; horses and carts were laden with tents, arms, munitions, banners, food, cooking utensils, faggots, lanterns, and other necessaries. The artillery was transported by water whenever it was possible, and it could be done fairly often, as Flanders had many waterways, natural and artificial, and many of the chief towns were linked together by them, but when none were available, horses dragged the guns.[1]

The expenses of the campaigns were very heavy; in 1384–5, war swallowed up more than five-sevenths of the money spent by Bruges, and the accounts show a considerable deficit.[2] Not only had the commune to feed and pay all its soldiers, but it equipped and clothed them as well, and we find it buying harness, saddles, cloth for "les chaperons rouges," and other articles.[3] Knights who fought for the commune were treated with the utmost generosity, if we may judge from what was done for William of Juliers—Bruges even paid his shoemaker, barber, and falconer.[4] On this occasion, fifty-seven persons and corporations, amongst whom the Canons of St. Donatian and M. de Gruuthuse were conspicuous, lent the city money to meet the demands made upon it.[5]

The number of the combatants was very small according to modern ideas, but we must remember the limited population of even comparatively large towns in those days. About seven thousand four hundred men fought on the Flemish side at the battle of Courtrai,[6] and Bruges sent two thousand four hundred to the siege of Oudenarde.[7]

In the early days the command of the militia was in the hands of the communal magistrates, but their powers could be delegated. Two *échevins* were in command at the battle of Woumen,[8] and two burgomasters and apparently some other officials went to the siege of Ghent.[9] The Dukes of Burgundy, however, reserved to themselves the right of nominating the chief captain.[10]

Different methods of recruiting were employed; sometimes clerks were sent round the city to draw up a list of the names of those whose duty it was to serve; sometimes a crier went up and down the streets asking for volunteers, and giving information as to the pay which was offered; and sometimes notices were put up in a public place.[11] The length of service varied; it might

[1] A, II., 380, 392; VI., 168.
[2] *Ibid.*, III., 38.
[3] *Ibid.*, I., 104, 133; II., 375, 377.
[4] *Ibid.*, I., 145–7.
[5] *Ibid.*, I., 110–111.
[6] Ffoulkes, *op. cit.*, 114.
[7] *A.*, II.. 384.
[8] *Ibid.*, 395.
[9] *Ibid.*, 399.
[10] *A, Table Analytique*, 290.
[11] *Ibid.*; *D.* 143.

be for two or three months, or for a few days, one contingent replacing another at the end of a short period.[1] Workmen were trained on the eves of Holy Days, which were half-holidays,[2] and in 1367 an ordinance charged governors of cities to order and persuade all young men to practise archery.[3]

In this manner Bruges trained and organised its citizen soldiers, and their achievements on the battlefield are sufficient proof of their efficiency, but during the latter part of the fifteenth century the prosperity of the city declined and the communal army lost its importance, and we do not hear of it taking any part in warfare after 1488.[4]

A. Abram.

[1] *A.* I., 85, 90, 161.
[2] *D.* 136.
[3] De Vigne, *op. cit.*, 22.
[4] *D.* 147.

[Students of military history should compare with this article Professor Tout's on "Firearms in England in the 14th Century" in the *English Historical Review*, xxvi., 666-702.—Ed.].

A MOSSTROOPER.

More than four hundred years ago, in the month of September, 1513, the battle of Flodden was fought. No English victory and no Scottish defeat has been half so be-rhymed; and the English prefer to sing of triumph, while the Scots find a sweeter melody in dirges over lost causes and fallen kings. The story of Flodden Field catches the fancy of poet and historian alike. Its name has a fine and warlike sound; the poets will have nothing to do with so harsh a word as Brankston, which the historians insist is more correct. Though it was not the last of the Border battles, as absent-minded people have been known to assert, it was certainly one of the best fought. But its fame rests chiefly on the romance of all its circumstances—the vivid obvious romance which appeals to poets who write for "soldiers, sailors, and young people," and to historians who do not look upon history as an object-lesson packed with morals for moderns, but as a living record of men long dead. This brief account of a man who fought at Flodden is addressed to those who are still stirred by the names of Sir Andrew Barton and the Lord Admiral Thomas Howard, and who can fall into a gentle melancholy to the tune of the "Flowers of the Forest."

Apart from the noblemen of great family and among the humbler knights and gentlemen of the two armies, none deserves a more honourable place in the history of the battle than the Bastard Heron. He was the son of Sir Roger Heron of Ford, and his proper style was John Heron of Crawley. All that is known of his fortunes is bound up with the war with Scotland.

About the year 1500 Sir Robert Carr of Caverton, eldest son of the laird of Cessford, was Warden of the Middle Marches of Scotland; he was hated by both English and Scottish mosstroopers, but his severity won him his master's favour, for James IV. was making determined efforts to put down the lawlessness of the Borders. Carr was rewarded with the offices of chief cup-bearer and master of the ordnance; but

his prosperous life was brought to a violent end. On a day of Border truce, when the English and Scottish wardens met to redress the wrongs done by either nation to the other, a quarrel broke out between Sir Robert and some of the English marchmen. This ended in a skirmish, in which three Englishmen, Lilburn, Starhead, and John Heron the Bastard, set upon and slew the Scottish Warden. "One came behind and ran him through his back with a lance; when he was wounded the other two despatched him quite." This account is from a Scottish historian and not very reliable; but even if the murder was not quite so dastardly as that, it was doubly unlawful because it was committed on a day of truce. King James, in his anger, threatened war with England, though the English Government had nothing to gain by the crime, and Henry VII. did all in his power to appease his future son-in-law. Lilburn was the only one of the offenders whom the English king was able to arrest; he was delivered to the Scots together with Sir William Heron of Ford as a pledge for his half-brother, John Heron, and other hostages. The prisoners were kept in Fast Castle, and there Lilburn and most of the others died of the plague. Henry further agreed that in expiation of the murder the Border meetings should henceforward be held in Scotland, and the English Warden should solemnly declare before each that the English Government had no part in the slaying of Robert Carr. This galling condition of peace was the cause of plentiful quarrels at a later date.

Meanwhile John Heron and Starhead lived in hiding; Heron may possibly have caused a report of his death to be spread as a greater safeguard. But on the death of Henry VII. in 1509 he appeared again in the north, living openly at his own house and taking his usual part in the raids into Scotland. His surname was strong enough to save him alike from the arm of the law and the vengeance of the Carrs. The latter was much the more pressing danger, for the law had a short memory and the matter was nearly ten years old.

Starhead also dropped all concealment, but he was afraid to return to the Marches, and took up his abode ninety miles away, where he thought he would be safe. The new laird of Cessford, Sir Andrew Carr, sent two of his tenants named Tait to avenge his father's death. They passed into England in disguise and sought out Starhead's dwelling. They "entered his house secretly in the night, for living so far from the Borders he thought he needed no watch; where they killed him, cut off his head, and brought it to Andrew; he, in testimony of his desired revenge,

sends it to Edinburgh and sets it up there upon a high and conspicuous place." John Heron was now the only one of the three slayers of Sir Robert Carr left alive.

In July, 1513, when England and Scotland were on the verge of war, King James wrote to Henry VIII. complaining of the wrongs done him by England. Among these were the slaying of Andrew Barton, the pirate hero of one of the finest of our sea-ballads, and the protection given to the Bastard Heron, who, though a murderer, lived at large, unmolested. Henry was then at the war in France, and before the letter reached him fighting on the Marches had begun.

In August, Lord Home, Warden of the East Marches, with three thousand horsemen of the Merse, raided the English Border, burning seven villages. Sir William Bulmer, High Sheriff of Durham, summoned the gentlemen of Northumberland to meet him with horse and harness and ride against the Scots. With about a thousand followers he hastened to Millfield, near Ford, to cut off Home's retreat. Here he laid his men in ambush among the broom bushes, and when the Scots came up, straggling, laden with booty, and weary in the hot August weather, they fell straight into the trap. Though they were three to one, the surprise was so complete that they were utterly routed, and only escaped with heavy loss, two hundred being slain and as many taken. This expedition was named the "Ill Rode" by the Scots, to the great delight of the victors.

The chronicles do not mention the Bastard Heron as present at Millfield. Nor does he appear in an account of the skirmish given in a certain long poem called "Flodden Field"; this work was probably composed towards the end of the sixteenth century, and for the sake of brevity we will call the writer of it the Elizabethan balladist. Heron was a favourite of this rhymester, who was saving him up for a specially effective entrance, as will be seen. The oldest and finest poem describing the Ill Rode is "Scottish Field"; it is written in alliterative verse and, in the opinion of good judges, dates from little more than two years after the battle. After an account of Home's invasion come the following verses :—

> "Then a knight of that country : that was knowen full wide
> One Sir William [Bulmer] : that bold was ever
> He moveth towards this menye : with men but a few,
> Not fully five hundred : that the freake followed;
> Then he met with a man : that had four hundred,
> That was bold Bastard Heron : that 'bashed was never,
> A warrior full wise : and wighty of deeds."

Heron does not appear elsewhere in "Scottish Field"; was he put in here simply for the sake of his reputation? This is not very likely, for the maker of the ballad ("a gentleman, by Jesu!") keeps, on the whole, close to facts, which no doubt he had learnt from men who had been in the war. There is some reason to believe that he was right in this case. The skirmish was on August 13th, and on the 18th John Heron, alias Heron of Crawley, alias of Harbottle, bastard, received a pardon for his offences. It seems quite possible that Katharine of Arragon, regent in the King's absence, granted Heron this pardon as a reward for gallantry in the field, for the dates allow plenty of time for the news to reach London. Moreover, George Home, brother of Lord Home, was taken prisoner, and the English shortly after offered to deliver him and three other prisoners of importance in exchange for Sir William Heron of Ford, who had been mewed up in Fastcastle all these years. If John Heron had a hand in taking these Scotsmen, it was all the more natural that they should be used to redeem the man who was enduring so hard a punishment for his brother's crime.

For the next mention of John Heron we must turn to the Elizabethan balladist. In his first six "fitts" he sets forth the causes and early movements of the war, following the chronicles very closely. Towards the end of August the King of Scots invaded England with a gallant host. While the English army under the Earl of Surrey was advancing to meet him, he spent his time in reducing Ford and other castles. When Surrey reached Alnwick on September 4th he sent Rouge Cross Pursuivant to James at Ford, reproaching him with breaking the truce and desiring him to stay and abide battle. Among several minor messages which the herald bore was the offer of four Scottish prisoners in exchange for Sir William Heron and an assurance that the Castle of Ford would not be cast down. Next day Surrey continued his advance. On September 6th a Scottish herald brought the defiances of his King. In reply to Surrey's message, James said that he desired nothing so much as battle, and suggested Friday, September 9th, as the day of meeting. The only answer he deigned to give to the proposed exchange was that he would shortly set the prisoners free himself. James was encamped upon Flodden Hill, a position said to be as strong as a fortress, and the odds were so far all against Surrey, who had to bring up an army ill-provisioned and tired to attack fresh troops well posted.

In all this the Elizabethan balladist agrees with the chronicles.

But he now brings in new matter, for which there is no authority but himself. His seventh "fitt" is almost a separate ballad in honour of the Bastard Heron, and rather a spirited one in its way, although the elaborate style of the sophisticated bard robs it of the charm and true poetry of the traditional ballad. We are told that the Earl of Surrey called a council of war to decide whether or no the English army should advance and risk a battle. The captains "bade set forth with manful mood":—

"Whereto the Earl did soon consent,
And quickly callèd for a guide
Lest by the way he harm might hent;
But hark what happenèd that tide.

"When th' army press'd[1] was to proceed
All 'rayed in ranks ready to fight,
Came scoring, all in scarlet red,
With lusty lance, a horseman light."

His face was hidden by a "veiled vizard," and he rode through the ranks straight up to the Earl:—

"All th' army marvell'd at this man
To see him ride in this array;
But what he was or whence he came
No wight there was could certain say

"When he the Earl of Surrey saw
From saddle light he leapèd there,
And down on knees did lout full low
Holding in hand his horse and spear.

"And on this sort he silence break,
'My lord,' quoth he, 'grant me some grace,
Pardon my life, for pity sake,
You have the Prince's power and place.' . . .

"Quoth the Earl, 'Then note us thy name,
Belike thou'st done some heinous deed;
Thou dare not show thy face for shame.
What is thy fact, declare with speed?'"

If he had never shed English blood nor been a traitor nor a rebel, the Earl was willing to pardon him. The stranger defied the whole world to touch him with treason; true, he had offended the King, but only by disobedience when in extremity:—

"'And as for murdering Englishmen,
I never hurt man, maid or wife;
Howbeit Scots some nine or ten
At least I have bereaved of life;

[1] I.e. "prest" = ready, French *prêt*.

"'Else I in time of wealth or want
Still to my king persisted true;
Wherefore, good lord, my life do grant,
My name then shortly I shall show.'"

The Earl bade him stand up, promising him full pardon, and adding :—

"'Thou seems to be a man indeed,
And of thy hands hardy and wight;
Of such a man we shall have need
Perchance on Friday next at night.'

"Then on his feet he starts up straight
And thanked the Earl at that tide;
Then on his horse he leapèd light
Saying, 'My lord, ye lack a guide.

"'But I shall you conduct full straight
To where the Scots encampèd are—
I know of old the Scottish sleight
And crafty stratagems of war,

"'Thereof experience hath me taught;
Now I shall show you who I am,
On Borders here I was up brought,
And Bastard Heron is my name.'"

Surrey replied that it was impossible ; Heron had died at least two years ago, of the pestilence, between Newark and Northampton, on the road to London, whither he was going to answer for the death of Sir Robert Carr. Said the Earl :—

"'Would God thy tale were true this tide
Thou Bastard Heron might be found,
Thou in this gate should be our guide,
I wot right well thou knows the ground.'"

"I am the same," declared Heron, raising his vizard, and the captains standing round recognised beyond doubt that it was he. He told them his strange tale. When the King summoned him to London he felt sure he would be executed if he arrived there, so on the way he wrought a wile :—

"'I nought but truth to you shall note;
That time in many a town and borough
The pestilence was raging hot,
And raging reigned all England thorough.

"'So coming to a certain town
I said I was infected sore,
And in a lodge they laid me down,
Where company I had no more

"'But my own secret servants three——'"

Of course, he was not really ill; he left the place secretly in the night and rode homewards. The servants framed a corpse in cunning sort, and carried it out for burial next morning, crying "Alas!" like men forlorn:—

"'The corpse they cunningly conveyed
And caused the bells aloud be rung,
And money to the priest they paid
And service for my soul was sung.

"'Which done they tidings straight did bring
Unto King Henry I was dead;
'Christ save his soul,' then said the King,
'For sure he should have lost his head.' . . .

"'To mansion mine I came at last,
By journeys nimbly all by night,
And now two years and more are passed
Since I aptly appeared in sight.

"'No wight did weet but I was dead,
Save my three servants and my wife;
Now I am start up in this stead
And come again from death to life.'"

All the knights and lords standing round burst out laughing at this story; they were overjoyed to find him alive, for they knew him for a man of good policy and tried truth:—

"Which was the cause so sore they craved
This Heron brave to be their guide.

"Then forth before he fiercely flew,
The Borderers bold to him they draw,
The total army did ensue,
And came that night to Wooler-Haugh."

It is a thousand pities to have to say that a meeting so strange and merry as this can never have taken place. I have already suggested that the writer may have followed some tradition based on fact, and that immediately after the murder of Sir Robert Carr, Heron may have employed such a stratagem. On the other hand, the Elizabethan balladist may simply have made the story up. In two places he comes very near to contradicting it himself. Early in the poem, when James and his nobles decide on war with England, Douglas, enumerating Scotland's wrongs, says:—

"'Hath not the Bastard Heron slain
Your warden with his spiteful spear?'"

But the real grievance was not the murder, for which the English Government had made reparation; but the protection of

the murderer—a grievance which could not exist if he were dead. The ballad also mentions the offer of four Scottish prisoners for Sir William Heron. But Sir William was only a pledge for his brother; if the Bastard was supposed to have been dead for two years the detention of Sir William would have been an English grievance, and Surrey would have taken a very different tone about it. Without considering other evidence, it is quite clear from this that neither English nor Scots can have believed Heron to be dead at this date.

About Heron's share in the battle itself there is no doubt whatever. By manœuvring in very difficult country Surrey succeeded in cutting off James's retreat to Scotland. James abandoned his position on Flodden Hill, and his army was drawn up in battle array upon Brankston Hill when the English advanced to the attack late on the afternoon of September 9th, 1513. The English army was in two divisions: the vanguard under the Admiral, Lord Thomas Howard, and the rearguard, commanded by Surrey in person, some way behind.

The first engagement took place on the extreme west of the field of battle. Edmund Howard and Sir Brian Tunstall on the Admiral's right wing were charged by the Earl of Huntly's highlanders and Lord Home's horsemen of the Merse. Tunstall fell in the front rank; the English began to waver. Lord Dacre was hurrying up to support them with the right wing of the rearguard, but at the first discharge of the Scottish ordnance part of his division, consisting of the men of Bamboroughshire and Tynemouth, turned and fled. They were followed by all Edmund Howard's division, who were Lancashire and Cheshire men, devoted to the house of Stanley, and furious at being sent into battle under a Howard. Edmund himself and a few knights and gentlemen alone held their ground. They were almost all slain; Edmund was cut off with only his standard-bearer and two servants. Three times he was felled to the ground. Sir David Home was swooping down with a company of horsemen to prevent him from falling back upon the Admiral. At this extremity a handful of English Borderers—"half a score of horsemen light"—came up to the deserted captain. At their head was the Bastard Heron, sorely wounded, who shouted to Howard, "There was never nobleman's son so like to be lost as you be this day; for all my hurts I shall here live and die with you." With the Bastard's spearmen they charged the Scots; Howard slew Sir David Home with his own hand, and the little company cut their way through to safety.

Meanwhile Dacre had steadied the remainder of his division. Under him advanced the men of Westmorland and Cumberland in "milkwhite coats and crosses red," and the prickers of Gilsland, Alston-moor, and the dales of Esk and Line. They charged and drove off Huntly and Home, saving the English from further danger on the right. Heron's troop seems to have formed part of Dacre's division, and he must have hurried on to the rescue when he saw Howard's standard in danger.

There is no need to give any further details of the battle. It is enough to say that the English were never again in so much danger; that the fight was close and bloody, and the issue in doubt until Sir Edward Stanley's victorious charge from the left with the second company of Lancashire and Cheshire men; and that the death of the King and the bravest men of Scotland, noble and common, spread mourning through all the land.

Edmund Howard was knighted by his father after the battle, an honour he would not have lived to win but for the Bastard Heron. Thirty-nine other knights were made at the same time. Heron was not among them, but he was almost the only upholder of the honour of Northumberland at Flodden; except for the flight of Tynemouth and Bamborough, little is said of the men of this county. William Percy, brother to the Earl of Northumberland, commanded the Percy tenants, and as he was one of the forty knights it is to be presumed his men fought well; but they were probably Yorkshiremen for the most part. The flower of Northumberland had followed the Earl to France, where they were winning high praise; and this is why nothing is heard of the marchmen of the upland dales at Flodden, and why the other northern shires all won more fame there than the shire in which the battle was fought.

After Flodden, Sir William Heron was exchanged for George Home, and came back to Ford at last. One cannot but wonder how the two brothers met—Sir William who had endured so long the weary life of a prisoner, and John who had slain his enemy, left the punishment to another, and finally won pardon, thanks, and fame in the war in which his brother could take no part. Perhaps Sir William bore it better than might be expected, for the responsibility of the head of a surname for the misdeeds of all his kinsmen was a doctrine never questioned on the Borders; a marchman would think Sir William unlucky, but not unjustly treated. The situation was all the stranger because John was the elder brother, and but for the bar sinister would have been master of Ford and head of his name.

It was long before a lasting peace was concluded with Scotland. John Heron was not the man to be behindhand in the night-riding, plundering, fire-raising forays that the wardens led across the Border. In 1514 he received a present of twenty pounds from the King, perhaps for his services at Flodden. In 1519 he was rewarded for helping to cast down Blackadder (in the Merse) and other Scottish strongholds; and later in the same year he was granted a pension. He was made constable for Ford Castle in a time of pressing danger, and he seems to have held the same office at Warkworth for a time.

Ten years after Flodden the warden raids were still being driven, for Henry was striving to make the Scottish side of the Marches a wilderness as far as the spoilers could ride. But as the country became more and more waste the gentlemen of Northumberland wearied of such unprofitable labour. In April, 1524, John Heron of Crawley and others did not rise and ride at the Warden's summons, and were in danger of being committed to gaol at Morpeth, Alnwick, or Newcastle for eight or ten days as a warning against sloth and disobedience.

On May 21st, 1524, being Trinity Sunday, a party of five hundred Scots came secretly into the East Marches of England by the fords of Tweed. They beset the highways, lying in wait for the merchants and marketmen on their way to Berwick, where a great fair was held yearly on this feast-day. They robbed many, but presently the alarm was given, and the country gathered to resist them. The Scots drew off towards Brankston and would certainly have escaped with all their booty if the young laird of Fowberry had not come up with a hundred light horse and fallen upon them. In the fight many were hurt and some slain, but about two hundred Scots were taken and the rest fled. The Warden, Lord Dacre, determined to revenge this expedition, and sent his brother into Scotland on July 5th following. Sir Philip Dacre had with him Sir Ralph Fenwick, Leonard Musgrave, Edward Aglionby, and John Tempest, all captains of the King's garrisons upon the Marches, and also several country gentlemen with their followers. Among the latter was John Heron, ready to atone for his late slackness. There were nearly a thousand men in all; they crossed the Tweed and burnt Smailholm, near Kelso, "a great town," which had not been burnt for many years; with much cattle and baggage they turned homewards.

Now it chanced that the Scots of Teviotdale were assembled in arms intending to ride into England, when they espied the

English host returning. Neither party had known before that the other was abroad, and the English were not yet aware of the Scots. Teviotdale were joined by the men of the Merse, who were either trysted with them or had risen on the alarm from Smailholm. Altogether the Scots were about two thousand strong. They gave up their proposed raid, and made their way to some ford or pass that the English were sure to cross, where they lighted down and lay close. When the English came suddenly upon their enemies, they too dismounted, set upon them "with good and fresh courage," and put them to flight. Then they leapt on their horses again and gave chase. In the pursuit they slew about thirty Scots, took nearly three hundred prisoners, and won three standards. But a company of the Scots still kept together, and when the English were scattered in the chase they set upon them in the rear, slew the Bastard Heron and six others, rescued some of their captured comrades, and took Sir Ralph Fenwick, Leonard Musgrave, and twenty more. Then came another sudden change in this running skirmish. The cries raised behind told the English pursuers what was happening; they turned and charged the victorious Scots, drove them off with more loss in slain and prisoners, and "kept and won the field clear without any further doubt, and so came home without any more hurt or damage." Lord Dacre thought this was "a fair fortune, seeing that of truth the Scots were two to one."

The English brought away close upon two hundred prisoners, but the Scots had kept Fenwick and the rest of the captured English. Heron was the only important person slain, but Dacre heard that Andrew Carr of Cessford, Warden of the Middle Marches, and Mark Carr, his uncle, were both so sore and evil hurt that it was doubted if they would live.

So the Bastard Heron fell in fight against Andrew Carr, the son of the man he had murdered so long ago on the day of truce. Cessford did not fulfil his vengeance unscathed, though he recovered from his wounds. Thereafter he was slain at Melrose—"When first the Scott and Carr were foes." His death was the cause of the most famous of all Border feuds—the feud which gave us the "Lay of the Last Minstrel."

John Heron died a marchman's death even as he had lived a true marchman, cunning, fierce, and good at need, a strength to his friends and a fear to his enemies. "The slaying of the Bastard Heron was more pleasure to the Scots than the taking of the two hundred was displeasure; they hated him so."

RUTH DODDS.

NOTES AND NEWS.

We have much pleasure in publishing in the current number two replies to the Creighton Lecture which appeared in October, one by Professor Ramsay Muir and the other by Mr. D. O. Malcolm, formely Fellow of All Souls', and now a director of the British South Africa Company. In the first number of the New Series of History we wrote : "We may even seek to bring the light of history to bear on the study of politics, and to supply in some measure that notable void in British intellectual equipment, the absence of any review which systematically endeavours to link the past with the present and to test modern experiment by historic experience." It is obvious that that testing involves discussion, and, indeed, that the methods of trial by history are themselves matter for historical debate. Lack of space, however, compels us to defer until April the publication of a reply to the arguments of Professor Muir and Mr. Malcolm.

* * * * * *

However close the connection may be between history and politics, History has nothing to do with party politics; but we cannot refrain from congratulating Dr. H. A. L. Fisher and ourselves not merely upon his appointment as Minister of Education, but upon the universal acceptance of the appointment of a historian to look after education as conclusive evidence of the reforming efficiency of Mr. Lloyd George's Government. We may be allowed to hope, without committing ourselves to political partisanship, that Dr. Fisher's tenure of office will be more permanent than that of any of his colleagues. Dr. Fisher's classical training at Winchester and Oxford, his sojourn at Paris and Göttingen, his career as a teacher and writer of history, his lectures in the United States and South Africa, his Vice-Chancellorship of a predominantly scientific and technological university like Sheffield, and his work on the Indian Civil Service Commission have provided an experience and induced a breadth of view which few could rival.

* * * * * *

No President of the Board of Education has assumed office in circumstances more critical for the interests he has in charge; and the multiplicity of counsels would make the Minister's burden intolerable if it were the English habit to refer

all problems to bureaucratic arbitration. It will, however, be the impossibility of the task rather than our conscious wisdom that will save us from the attempt to introduce uniform curricula into our schools and universities. Certainly no university should be exactly like any other university, and no historical, classical, scientific, legal, or modern language school in a university should seek to reproduce the respective schools of another. If we are to have a uniform military training, that will be all the more reason for cultivating, for the sake of human freedom, a multiform intellectual training "lest one good custom should corrupt the world." It will not be altogether a disaster if the attempts to draft a uniform scheme of primary and secondary education for boys and girls up to the age of sixteen break down. No one can ever be really educated except by means of a study in which he or she is thoroughly interested; and, granted that interest, it does not so very much matter what that subject is. The worst of all schemes would be one that restricted to two or three hours a week the study in which lies the heart of the student. We do not wish to abolish compulsory Greek for the sake of compulsory pemmican.

* * * * * *

There are one or two other cautions which need to be borne in mind. The object of education is not merely knowledge, but also understanding. The facts one learns in one's youth one forgets; it is the training and understanding that remain and are priceless. Yet is not the straining after mere memorised facts one of the causes of our efforts to cram more and more subjects into every child's mind and more and more detail into every subject? Secondly, no scheme of education can ever be satisfactory which regards adolescence alone as the period of education. Education is a life-long process; and the purpose of a school and a university career is to show the student how to educate himself in the life that lies before him.

* * * * * *

With some of the details of these various problems the Council of the Historical Association has been wrestling long and earnestly. Its representatives on the joint conference of the five associations, whose report we published in October, have with the representatives of the other associations coalesced with a committee of the British Academy to form a Council for Humanistic Studies, with Lord Bryce as president, Sir Frederick Kenyon as chairman, and Miss Curran as secretary. As Professor Tout already represented the British Academy on this

Council, Professor Pollard was appointed in his place to represent the Historical Association in conjunction with Mr. Greene and Mr. Marten. One meeting has already been held with the Council for Scientific Studies.

* * * * * *

The Council of the Historical Association has also discussed at length various questions submitted to it by the Board of Education's Committee on the Teaching of Modern Languages relative to the possibilities of co-operation between the two studies. It emphasised the need for history in modern language studies and for modern languages in historical studies, but was inclined to doubt the wisdom and practicability of amalgamation either in university schools or in the persons of the same teachers. A similar doubt with respect to the proposal to amalgamate history scholarships with those in ancient and modern languages is expressed in the report of a committee on the subject which has been adopted by the Council, and runs as follows :—

Your Committee (A. J. Williams of Mill Hill, C. H. K. Marten of Eton, and J. E. Morris of Bedford) have been in communication with the teachers of history in several schools on the question of history scholarships for boys. The occasion of the appointment of the Committee was a suggestion at the Headmasters' Conference that more weight should be given in the scholarship examinations to classics or modern languages: the suggestion has not materialised, but may be renewed at any moment. We put forward the following resolutions for the consideration of the Council :—

1. This Council is of opinion that boys who show taste and enthusiasm for history and allied subjects should be encouraged to study these in some special degree, yet not to the entire exclusion of other subjects in the curriculum, in their last one or two years at school; that there are many such boys of distinct intellectual ability, by no means inferior to that of the classical students, but of a different type, who may be dulled by an enforced and prolonged study of other subjects not wholly congenial to them; and that the history scholarship examinations, capable possibly of improvement in some few cases, set at the present time a satisfactory standard, influencing thereby the work of boys in lower classes, and encouraging many to read and like history who fall short of scholarship form.

2. Though agreeing that candidates for history scholarships should be given an opportunity, as they are at present, to show their ability to translate from ancient or modern languages, or to show their appreciation of literature, and that promising work in such subjects should be considered, this Council yet views with great apprehension any proposal to amalgamate the history scholarships with those in ancient and modern languages; it fears that facility in expression may be considered as superior to the love of knowledge for knowledge' sake, which is sometimes wrongly confused with "cram."

3. This Council recognises that history scholarships attract candidates from other schools than those represented in the Headmasters' Conference, and have been won sometimes by working men, so that to insist upon pro-

ficiency in classics would be detrimental to a considerable, possibly in the future to a large, number of such candidates who may lack only the opportunity to be good classical scholars. It approves of the tendency of examiners at the present time to consider in their award any special promise shown in any of the papers, and not to refuse to elect a candidate who by force of circumstances may be unable to do himself justice in one particular paper.

4. The Council, therefore, ventures to hope that college authorities will consider very carefully any proposal that changes should be made in these examinations which influence the teaching of history in schools and have great value in the education of the nation.

* * * * * *

Another suggestion with respect to the interdependence of history and languages, viz., that students who have graduated B.A. in an honours school of history should be allowed to take an M.A. in languages, illustrates the difficulty of uniform legislation for diverse universities. In some universities, where the M.A. is merely a matter of paying fees and passing time, the proposal would be a reform; but in other universities, where the M.A. involves a course of not less than two years' post-graduate study and the production of a serious piece of original research, the proposal could hardly be regarded as an equivalent alternative to the existing course. All these, however, are matters on which others than the Council of the Historical Association and the Editorial Board of HISTORY should have views, and we hope to see them ventilated in our correspondence columns.

* * * * * *

History has been so much to the fore during the last quarter that it is only possible just to refer to one or two articles on the subject in periodical literature. *The Times* Educational Supplement for October 19 contained an interesting survey from its Irish correspondent of the teaching of history in Ireland. The *Daily Telegraph* on November 3 urged in a leading article that a competent body of historians should at once be set to work to collect and sift materials for the history of the war, which may otherwise be lost and never recovered—a counsel of perfection. The *Westminster Gazette*, in a series of articles by Mr. F. Y. Eccles, has called attention to the French *Anthologie des Écrivains français morts pour la Patrie*, which includes a goodly number of historians. For ourselves, we have fewer losses to record than in our last number, but we cannot omit to mention the death in action of a contributor to HISTORY, Mr. E. A. Fulton, Assistant in the Department of History at University College, London.

CORRESPONDENCE.

SIR,

In writing to support Miss Constance Stewart's letter in the first number of the new series of HISTORY, I should like to add the testimony of my personal experience as to the advantages of adding a study of world-history to the curriculum.

I have now for several years taught this subject to middle school girls. The syllabus, the work of my predecessor in the post, consists of a two years' course. The first year aims at giving in outline a knowledge of the Early Eastern Empires and of Greece and Rome, whilst in the following year my pupils continue the outlines of European history to the conclusion of the Thirty Years' War. The girls then pass into the upper school, where they study periods of English history in detail. In Form VI. they also study detailed periods of European history.

It is the value of the two years' study of the outlines of world-history in the middle school that I wish to emphasise.

I find that the main lines of historical development are really appreciated; that my pupils' minds and points of view are widened by the study of civilisations other than their own; that their return to the study of English history is marked by a vigour and a keenness which do not desert them throughout their school career; that they have a better conception of historical values and a clearer sense of the lapse of time.

I should be very loth to substitute for this two years' study any scheme which had the glorification of British Imperialism for its main object, or, indeed, to make my teaching of general history subordinate to the relation of these islands to other countries. Any such scheme would seem to me to detract seriously from the educational value of the subject.

Yours, etc.,
P. WOODHAM SMITH.

SIR,

Your correspondent Mr. Geo. E. Eades, and others interested in providing lectures on historical subjects, should find no difficulty in having their services accepted by most librarians of our public libraries where lectures form part of their work. Manchester is quoted as having rendered yeoman service, but there are libraries all over the country each with a *clientèle* ready to welcome single lectures or courses by competent people. Let the Historical Association at its various branches see that the public libraries are not overlooked when seeking for a means of representing to the general public the needs and interests of historical study and teaching.

Yours faithfully,
"HISTORICUS."

[A practical comment on the above letter is provided by the notice we are asked to give by the Fulham Public Libraries Committee of a course of public lectures on subjects connected with the war on Thursdays at 8 p.m. from January 4th to March 29th. The lecturers include no fewer than four members of the Council of the Historical Association, Drs. Newton, Reid, and Skeel, and Mr. J. A. White. Further details can be obtained from Mr. Walter S. C. Rae, The Central Library, 598 Fulham Road, S.W.—ED.]

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

The Story of the Buddha. By Edith Holland. "Heroes of All Time" Series. George G. Harrap and Co. 1916.

This book does not claim to be a strictly historical essay. In the Foreword (addressed, it seems, to young readers) the author speaks of "fact and legend mingled together" as the characteristic of early histories. She promises no more than this in her own work. "After all," she says, "we know that the events of chief importance in the Buddha's beautiful life are historical facts, and that is all that really matters."

It would be hardly reasonable to criticise the book from any other standpoint than that which the writer herself has chosen. She puts aside questions of authenticity and refrains from giving references. In this way, perhaps the only way to reproduce a vast picture in so small a sketch, the Buddha's life is transcribed here from the general impression visible in the legend, art, and worship of all Buddhist countries. To explain that there are various traditions, texts in various languages, different types of Buddhist art, and so on, is the business of Orientalists; so is the very lively discussion that results. But the student of human history will find that from whatever region of the Buddhist world or from whatever documents it may be drawn, the figure of the Buddha emerges always the same in outline and in colour. The traditions have never varied in the sense of marring the spiritual beauty of the picture.

As to Buddhism, the writer deals, of course, with the religious and ethical side, and chiefly with the Buddha's example. We observe that the list of authorities (by no means a long one) consists for the most part of Rhys Davids' fascinating writings with Hermann Oldenburg's Buddha, from the Pali, and Rockhill's account from Tibetan sources. These are all admirably clear, and, moreover, they are books for the general reader. But there are nowadays more and more readers who want something simpler still. There is (to those who observe the demands and tendencies of the time) something to be hoped from the modern desire to know more of the religions and ideals of our fellow-men. Perhaps the desire does not lead to much hard study, but it calls for much good teaching; and this may be given partly in cheap little books of the right sort. Such books must generally be compilations from other books of greater learning and authority, but they may be none the less useful for that, if compiled honestly and with taste and measure. These, with a certain attractive simplicity and sympathy, are qualities of Edith Holland's little book which should make it welcome to readers. The illustrations, by the way, are not very happy, but the volume, light to hold and well printed, is generally pleasing in appearance.

Mabel H. Bode.

A Short History of the English People. By JOHN RICHARD GREEN. Revised and enlarged, with Epilogue by Alice Stopford Green. 8vo. Pp. xlvii + 1040, 6 maps. 1916. Macmillan. 5*s.* net.

To many teachers the appearance of an edition of Green's *Short History* at 5*s.* is somewhat of an event. They know that nothing does more to stunt, if not to kill, the natural interest of adolescent boys and girls in history—in human life and character, in the origins of living forces still swaying the world in which they have themselves so soon to play their parts—than its enforced association with books specially designed "for the upper forms of schools." The mere outward appearance of such books is generally repellent, suggesting the classroom, not the library; the inky desk, not the private bookshelf; learning lessons, not reading. Often the contents are still more repellent. Even the best are marred by the trail of the examiner, the supposed necessity for including every fact or fiction of which knowledge might be required in—say—a London matriculation paper; many are pervaded by the subtle atmosphere of boredom which clings to mere "bread and butter" work; a few are well written, but the style of others is of the type, at once condescending and technical, peculiar to school textbooks. By the mere fact of their having been produced for school use only, they convey the baneful suggestion that history is a subject like arithmetic, to be studied once for all at school and dropped when real life begins. The books in the school library should, it is true, counteract that impression; but many secondary schools have no library available for the use of pupils below the sixth, and where such a library exists it seldom contains more than one copy of a book. In any case the educational value to a boy or girl of a book which can be added to the family library is far greater than that of one which is regarded as part of the apparatus of school.

Within the last few years a little has been done to remove this handicap, by the appearance of some admirable historical work among the volumes of the *Home University Library*. But those alone do not go far, and the most desirable books are still too expensive. While complete school histories of England and of Europe can be obtained for 5*s.* or less, and books supposed to include all that need be known about a "period" for 2*s.* 6*d.*, it will be difficult to persuade headmasters and mistresses, knowing what a tax the cost of school books is to many parents, to sanction the use as a form textbook of, for example, *The Holy Roman Empire*, at 7*s.* 6*d.*; *Factors in Modern History*, at 7*s.* 6*d.*; a volume of Longman's *Political History*, at 7*s.* 6*d.*; or of Methuen's *History of England*, at 10*s.* 6*d.*; *The Expansion of England*, at 4*s.*; or—till now—the *Short History*, at 8*s.* 6*d.* Consequently, many of the boys and girls who go straight from school to their work in the world would assent to Lamb's classification of history books among *biblia a-biblia*, with scientific treatises and Directories. No one who had read a single chapter of it could regard the *Short History* as a *biblion a-biblion*; and Messrs. Macmillan are to be congratulated on being the first publishers to issue a copyright historical work of such standing at a price which will enable it to compete with any school-book covering the same ground.

The congratulations need be none the less hearty because the first edition of the *Short History* is no longer copyright. Doubtless

there will be many reprints of this during the next few years; one, most unworthily supplemented, has already appeared in *Everyman's Library*. But the second (1888), now revised and reprinted, is much more valuable than the first. To it is prefixed the beautiful Introduction telling how the *Short History* came to be written and what manner of man was its creator; and it embodies the numerous and important corrections made by Mrs. Green in accordance with her husband's last wishes. In these she was guided by the work of revision already done by Green himself; they involved various additions amounting altogether to some twenty pages, including the remarkable passage (p. 721) on England's part in the "European Commonwealth" since 1712, upholding "the force of international engagements and the sanctity of treaties."

Since 1888 Mrs. Green has left the text practically untouched, except with regard to Ireland, the subject of her own researches; her revision has otherwise been confined to the merest details of wording, concerning matters of fact.[1] And wisely so: further alterations would have impaired the unity of the work, and with that both its artistic and its scientific value. As it stands it gives, coherently and definitely, the general conclusions regarding English history reached by scholars about 1882, presented in a most attractive form. The drastic editing which would be needed to bring a few sections (*e.g.* that on the Great Charter) into agreement with the results of the latest research could not be done without striking new notes which would impair the harmony of the whole, and introducing new factors whose presence would disturb the coherence of the subsequent argument. Moreover, each fresh edition would itself be out of date in some particular as soon as issued, so long as the study of history remains a living thing. The very necessity for correcting at a few definite points the book a class is using may be turned to good account by a competent teacher, who can thereby lead his pupils to realise that discoveries are still being made, in history as in any other science, and that historians are thus enabled to throw fresh light not only on the past, but on the problems of the present. For the sake of the general reader, however, one might plead for the insertion in future editions of a prefatory note indicating that the lists of authorities cited do not as a rule include any not consulted by the author, and that much historical work of great importance has been published since. Such a note would on the whole be preferable to an extension of the few bracketed additions made to the lists in 1888; it is not clear upon what principle these were selected, and their presence is somewhat misleading, as it suggests that no other additions are necessary. It is, of course, most important that the lists themselves, indicating as they do the sources

[1] There are points at which some further revision of this kind may be hoped for when this edition is reprinted. Several of the references in the lists of authorities (considerably altered in 1888) might well be made more definite: for example, no one who tried to find in a library "the great series of the Royal Rolls" (p. 122), or Soranzo (p. 349), would be likely, without further help, to light upon the Calendars of Patent and Close Rolls, etc., or of Venetian State Papers; Green's delightful papers on Oxford (p. 132) are now more accessible in *Stray Studies* than in *Macmillan's Magazine;* and neither the Calendar of State Papers, Domestic (p. 474), nor Gardiner's *History* (p. 535) now ends at 1644. The latter reference would be better inserted at the end of the list on pp. 493–4, and that to Lecky's *History* on p. 721 instead of p. 757. And there are still a few verbal slips, for instance, the statement that the Great Charter was "signed."

upon which the narrative is based, should remain unaltered. The real value of the book is undiminished by the need for such corrections and additions, inseparable from its age. For forty years it has stood unrivalled, the one complete history of England, which is both a work of scholarship and a work of art, large in scope, yet moderate in size and price, clear in general plan, yet full of illuminating detail.

The Epilogue with which Mrs. Green has enriched this latest edition carries on the narrative from the peace of 1815 to the outbreak of war in 1914, replacing the original brief summary of eight pages (1815—1874) with nearly two hundred. In other respects her work resembles her husband's; there is a similar felicity and wealth of quotations, vivid treatment of past problems, making them appear as real and urgent as those of the present day, and passionate sympathy with the poor and the oppressed. But the Epilogue is divided into two sections, "The Social Revolution" and "Foreign and Colonial Policy," and the dichotomy at once indicates a difference of method: a characteristic of the *Short History* is the absence of any such divisions, the close connexion maintained throughout between various aspects of national life. Some such straightforward simplification of the complex history of the last century may well have been inevitable, in order to avoid the false simplification attainable by the omission of essential facts. But it is doubtful whether any future historian will endorse so drastic a separation of the most wonderful of all its activities, its expansion from one into five free nations, from other aspects of the development of English democracy during the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, apart from its association with foreign affairs, the treatment of the history of the Dominions is full and sympathetic; more sympathetic than that of other parts of the Empire, where Mrs. Green's righteous hatred of the ugly side of jingo imperialism has led her to give but a somewhat tardy and grudging recognition (pp. 992—3) to the hard and devoted work of the English officials who carry on the Government of India, the Crown colonies, and the protectorates. It has not been only administrators of "Scottish and Irish origin" (p. 941) who have played prominent parts in "the peaceful and humane government" of India; and Northern Nigeria is an outstanding but by no means solitary instance of the guardianship of native civilisations by Englishmen who

> Serve and love the lands they rule,
> Asking praise nor guerdon.

Doubtless, however, Mrs. Green decided to regard imperial mainly from the point of view of foreign affairs because of the great advantage thus gained in dealing with the latter. The existence and growth of the British Empire (including India and Egypt), with the colonial ambitions of other European nations, have been essential factors in every international complication since 1815; and her survey of the diplomatic history not only of England but of the European Powers in general during the past century, leading up to the causes of the present war, owes much both in clearness and fairness to her ample recognition of that fact.

Admirable as that survey is, however, one feels she was herself more interested in the first section of her Epilogue, "The Social Revolution." It is a brilliant record of political, constitutional, and economic change; of the advent of democracy, the gradual overthrow

of the ancient class domination, Whig or Tory, the increasing influence of the "Celtic fringe." Written mainly from the point of view of the House of Commons, it touches practically every social movement during the century which was reflected in legislation or brought about the rise and fall of statesmen or of parties; conversely, it deals with very briefly or altogether omits other aspects of social history. There are references to education, but scant justice is done to the pioneer work of the British and Foreign Society and the National Society, and less space is given to the great Act of 1870 than to that of 1902. Except as regards the removal of tests or the disestablishment of the Irish Church, religion is ignored, and there is no mention of the intellectual revolution which began with the publication of the *Origin of Species*. Much is said of Bentham and Cobbett, something of Mill and Owen, Karl Marx and Henry George; but nothing of the influence of Carlyle or Ruskin or Dickens, of Mrs. Browning's "Cry of the Children," of F. D. Maurice, Herbert Spencer, or T. H. Green, or of the Fabian Society. The emphasis on its political rather than its social consequences obscures the real importance of the Poor Law of 1834; even the barest summary of the antecedent conditions, such as that given in the Report of 1909, shows how great an improvement it brought about in the position of the labouring classes by sweeping away abuses utterly degrading to them. Different social movements receive unequal treatment, *e.g.*, much attention is given to the co-operative, practically none to the friendly, societies. Such limitations are doubtless intentional; the unflagging interest of the undeviating narrative may well be held to justify them.

Green feared that the history of England since 1815 was "too near to us as yet to admit of a cool and purely historical treatment"; and Mrs. Green, while distributing praise and blame with an even hand among men of every party, has made no attempt to disguise her own views. The Epilogue is none the less wholesome reading on that account for English people, thus enabled to see themselves and their rulers with the candid eyes of an Irish Nationalist sympathising warmly with the Labour movement. It is especially to be hoped that it may be read by many boys and girls in the public schools, where deference to the supposed views of the majority of the parents often brings about a one-sided provision of literature dealing with recent or contemporary politics: in one at least, not a single journal or newspaper out of the considerable number to which the boys have access represents even Liberal, to say nothing of Labour or Nationalist, political opinion. One wonders that the history masters have not effectively protested long ago against such unhistorical treatment of current history.

E. Jeffries Davis.

Scotland. By R. L. Mackie, M.A. "Great Nations" Series. Harrap and Co. 1916. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

This is a well-arranged and well-written survey of Scottish history down to the death of Sir Walter Scott, based for the most part on a careful study of secondary authorities. It is a pity that Mr. Mackie did not include among these Mr. Barron's *War of Independence*, as he has thereby missed an opportunity of presenting part of the national history in a new light. Nevertheless, if his summary of the political history of Scotland, clear and impartial

as it is, adds little to our knowledge, it is otherwise with his chapters on Scottish constitutional and social history. In these he breaks new ground; and if he has largely followed Professor Rait in his account of the constitutional development of Scotland, his description of the social and economic development is nearly all his own. In it he has made admirable use of his intimate knowledge of Scottish literature, and the result is a series of chapters which make his book a valuable, and, indeed, indispensable, supplement to the established political histories. Its value is enhanced by a number of well-chosen illustrations. R. R. Reid.

The False Dmitri: a Russian Romance and Tragedy. Described by British Eye-witnesses, 1604-1612. Edited, with a preface, by Sonia E. Howe. Williams and Norgate. Pp. xvi., 239. 1916.

Mrs. Howe has here collected a strange medley relating to the famous Russian "Time of Troubles" early in the seventeenth century, when pretender after pretender aspired to the throne, and Russia seemed doomed to suffer at the hands of her neighbours, led by Poland, the fate of partition which she inflicted on Poland nearly two hundred years later. The four letters may very probably be genuine, and most of the narratives Mrs. Howe reprints are contemporary and occasionally contain good testimony to their veracity. For instance, on p. 33 the anonymous author of *The Reporte of a Bloudie Massacre* refers to "the French Captaine, who was called Iaques Margareth," and served under the false Dmitri; now Margaret's narrative, though Mrs. Howe does not allude to the fact, has been preserved, and provides an interesting comparison with those reprinted in this volume. But J. F.'s *Brief Historical Relation* (pp. 185-220) is a fantastic concoction, published in 1654, forty-eight years after the events described; and J. F. had not the most elementary knowledge of Russian history or regard for the truth. He avers (pp. 190–3) that Ivan the Terrible was crowned in 1524, reigned thirty-five-years, was succeeded by his son Feodor, who reigned fifteen years and died in 1566! The arithmetic alone is impossible: Ivan was crowned in 1533, reigned until 1584, and was succeeded by Feodor, who reigned from 1584 to 1598. J. F. proceeds (p. 200) to state that Boris, who succeeded Feodor, reigned thirty-six years (he really reigned seven), and that Basil V., the so-called usurper, perished miserably in 1610, though as a matter of fact his restoration to the throne was seriously considered in 1613. After this, it is a mere trifle that he puts Dmitri's invading host at 240,000 horse, while Rambaud estimates it at 1600. J. F. seems to have been weak in the intellect: he had come into conflict with the law, and in 1654 was looking to Oliver Cromwell to carry out the suggestions of Barebones' Parliament and make a clean sweep of the old English–French law and "cormorant-lawyers." He discovered in the Tsar Boris a worthy example for Cromwell to follow; and after recounting in highly imaginative terms the Tsar's "reforms," he exclaims: "O what happiness, what peace, what concord, would such a course of justice produce here in England!" (p. 196). It was an unfortunate parallel: Boris, like Cromwell, had secured sovereignty without any hereditary claim; but his conduct resembled Richard III.'s. He was almost certainly responsible for the murder of his nephew, the real Dimitri, and his "reforms" consisted mainly

in the assistance he gave the lesser Russian landlords in their efforts to convert their peasants into serfs.

We think Mrs. Howe would have done well to provide some correction of these narratives, instead of leaving the reader at their mercy. She does, indeed, supply a list of the variations of spelling under which the chief actors' names appear. But why should Feodorovitz in *A Bloudie Massacre* be always misprinted Fendronitz? This is not a phonetic variation, but a mere printer's error, which need not have been preserved. And how many readers will discover "Viborg" in "Weyborough"? There might also have been a brief indication of the work that has been done on the fascinating problem of the false Dmitri, or rather the three (if not more) false Dmitris; for their story is far more wonderful than that of Lambert Simnel or Perkin Warbeck. As it is, the reader will be hopelessly misled by these narratives unless he refers for help to such a book as Father Pierling's *Rome et Demetrius*, or at least to some works on Russian and Polish history, like Rambaud's, Morfill's, or Nisbet Bain's. The contemporary writers were not in touch with their Governments, they had no access to archives, and they are merely dealing with spectacular history; their narratives are the sort of history which now gets into the cinemas.

A. F. Pollard.

The Navy of the Restoration, from the Death of Cromwell to the Treaty of Breda: Its Work, Growth, and Influence. By Arthur W. Tedder, B.A., Magdalene College, Cambridge. Cambridge Historical Essays. University Press. 1916.

Mr. Tedder has produced a painstaking study of his subject, marked with all the good qualities we are accustomed to expect from an expanded post-graduate thesis. To many it may not prove attractive. It is not an attractive period in our naval history, and he does not flinch from sweeping out its unsavoury corners. His exhaustive account of the defective supply of the Fleet, particularly in the matter of victuals and raising men, is almost too conscientious. The abuses were, unfortunately, no special characteristic of the Restoration Navy. At other periods the Navy rose superior to them till they finally disappeared in comparatively recent times. The labour lavished by Mr. Tedder on this well-worn theme will be grudged the more since in other sections of his book he displays a capacity for work in more productive fields. This is especially the case in his account of the part which the Navy played in the actual work of the Restoration. It would be difficult to find elsewhere so fresh and full a treatment of the subject. Possibly from not keeping more clearly in view what the Army was doing simultaneously, the effect is to over-emphasise the share of the Fleet; but this, in any case, is a pardonable reaction, seeing how much we have been inclined to ignore or underestimate it.

In his chapters on the Mediterranean and the Second Dutch War, though in these there is less room for original treatment, Mr. Tedder shows himself an apt pupil of the school in which he received his training. So well, indeed, does he appear to have absorbed the diet it prescribes, that when he fails we feel inclined to quarrel with the school rather than with the pupil.

The whole book, indeed, is so good a specimen of its class that

it compels a doubt as to whether the system of training is all that it should be. The habit of minutely supporting every fragment of fact seems to be breeding the spirit of a collector rather than that of an historian—a delight in amassing facts for their own sake, with too little regard to their relative value. There is a tendency to lose sight of purpose and proportion. We have from Mr. Tedder, for instance, a careful reference for every scrap of evidence he has unearthed in regard to administration, and then in his narrative we come to the statement that the Mediterranean was still eclipsed by the Atlantic in both political and commercial importance. Now the relative value of Mediterranean and Atlantic trade is a very large and a very difficult question. Yet here we have no reference at all, although the point is vital to much of his argument about our early Mediterranean policy. To find a statement of this character unsupported amid so much good documentation raises an uneasy feeling that our system is not producing quite the habit of mind we desire. A feeling for proportion has not been acquired; the tendency to facile generalisation has not been sufficiently disciplined.

This defective training in proportion takes other forms. In the account of the Second Dutch War we suddenly stumble on De Ruyter's "tour of reprisal" quite incidentally, and all we are told of it is in a parenthesis of five words. Yet De Ruyter's famous cruise had scarcely less influence on our naval disposition at the time than that of Von Spee had in the present war. So inadequate a treatment of such an episode could scarcely have satisfied a student whose attention had been seriously drawn to the importance of weighing the relative value of his facts before constructing his story, and of not being satisfied with mere collection and verification.

Nor is this a case only of a defective feeling for proportion. It also suggests—as, indeed, the whole book suggests—that there has been too little instruction in the art of narrative. With all its good qualities, the book reveals little sense of the vital importance of marshalling the facts after they have been collected and weighed. The science is there, but the art has been let go to the winds. There is no reason why the two should not be taught together. A sound study in the artistic methods of Macaulay or Froude, to say nothing of the greater masters, need in no way prejudice the rigour of scientific accuracy.

It would be invidious in a work so full of promise to point out other awkwardnesses and loss of lucidity and force in the construction of the narrative, but a word of warning on style must be permitted. Far be it from us to deny our literary English the invigoration of a constant inflow of slang, but it should not be admitted raw and immature, and this is an error which Mr. Tedder has not been taught to avoid. He has an unhappy fondness for such words as "futile"—the commonplaces of a certain class of journalism. Even if these may be condoned, such expressions as "fizzled out," "squabbling sects," "did himself well," "bluff," and the like have not yet acquired credentials sufficient to give them a place in serious historical writing. Why should not these matters be subjected to as severe a discipline as we apply to the collection of facts?

Grace of style, lucidity and force in arrangement, balance in selection are all as necessary to history as sound documentation. But they seem to be finding but a low seat in our schools, and what is the result? We are creating a school of excellent specialists who

will read each other's books, but are we equipping men for the great work of fostering a national historic sense, of enriching public judgment with the wisdom of past experience, and of widening horizons for those whose hands are on the helm of State?

These things are doubtless a counsel of perfection. Art in history is the most difficult side to acquire—if by art we mean the power of arresting attention and conveying the impression we wish to convey. It also depends more than the scientific side on personality and individual capacity and endeavour. We feel sure it is within Mr. Tedder's reach, and we may heartily welcome him as a promising recruit for naval history. JULIAN CORBETT.

The History of South Africa from 1795 *to* 1872. By G. McC. THEAL. In five volumes. Fourth edition, revised and enlarged. Vol. I., pp. xix+510; Vol. II., pp. xvi+506; Vol. III., pp. xvi+496. London. 1915–16. Allen and Unwin.

THE new edition of Dr. Theal's well-known work, of which the first three volumes are here noticed, has been considerably revised and enlarged in view of further researches by its indefatigable author among the official documents of which he was for so many years the Keeper. The period dealt with extends from the surrender of Cape Town to the British forces on September 16th, 1795, to the grant of responsible government to Cape Colony in 1872, and the present three volumes carry the story down to the end of the Basuto War in 1858. It is rarely that so short a period of the history of a colony can be treated on so ample a scale, and a reader to whom the subject was new might warrantably expect to come to Dr. Theal's pages for guidance and enlightenment as to the causes that made English rule in South Africa so comparatively unsuccessful. The causes cannot be entirely attributed to any inherent inability of Englishmen to deal with colonists who speak another tongue, for in Canada French and English have worked in harmony, and in British Guiana and Ceylon British rule has followed upon Dutch with complete success. But those who seek the explanation in these volumes will be woefully disappointed, for never does the author have sufficient complaisance to those less familiar with his subject than himself to stand away from the even flow of his narrative for a moment and interpret for us, as doubtless he has done for himself, some of the movements that have brought about the happenings that he narrates with such profusion of detail.

It has sometimes been said that the professions of the archivist and the historian are separated by as wide a gulf as that which divides the practical miner from the professor of geology. The taunt is certainly not a true one, as can be shown by the mention of French and Belgian writers like Bémont and Pirenne, and among Englishmen of James Gairdner, not merely the miner in the archives of the Tudors, but also their historian and interpreter. But Dr. Theal goes far to prove to us that there is justice in the claim against the archivist, for his volumes contain rather the annals of South Africa than its history in the nineteenth century. It may be the duty of an annalist to record with indiscriminating fidelity the exact numbers of emigrants brought out from England on each ship during the course of a certain summer, or the names of the members who voted for or against certain resolutions in the Council of the Colony, though it is to be doubted whether the editor of a

Calendar of State Papers would consider such things worthy of notice; but the task of the historian is somewhat more difficult than this, and, after all, more attractive both for himself and his readers. It is surely incumbent upon him not merely to present us with a clear and readable narrative, but to make certain that what he selects for narration is of importance in tracing out the development of the political community with which he deals, and that he shall do something while writing "without fear, favour, or prejudice," and, in the unbiassed way upon which Dr. Theal prides himself, to make clear to the student the main lines along which the growth of the social organism has proceeded. The British colonies are not self-contained units, whose history can be either recorded or understood even by the most intense application to the details of events only within their own borders; they are parts of the British Empire and the world, and it would appear almost a truism to suggest that unless the historian of a colony does something to tell its story in relation to the story of the great Empire of which it is but a chapter, his work is fragmentary and incomplete. He may have written with the greatest of devotion and an infinity of care, and yet his book should be classified rather with the Annual Register than with the work of Lecky, of Gardiner or of Francis Parkman.

ARTHUR PERCIVAL NEWTON.

Germany, 1815—1890. By SIR ADOLPHUS WILLIAM WARD, F.B.A., Litt.D., Master of Peterhouse. Vol. I. 1815—1852. Cambridge University Press. Pp. xiv + 591. 6*s*. net.

THERE must be few teachers of history, in schools at any rate, who have not been required during the last two years to improvise or simulate a knowledge of German history in the nineteenth century; and in some cases the improvisation has taken the form of lectures provided by education authorities for teachers and repeated by them from memory to their classes. To such depths have our masters of education been reduced by their systematic neglect of history in the past. Even now it has not apparently occurred to them that the first requisites for historical education in their schools are competent teachers and adequate school libraries, and that if there is to be improvisation an intelligent teacher will gather a great deal more from half a dozen good books than from a dozen lectures. Sir Adolphus Ward's is a volume which should be on the shelves of every school library. No Englishman knows German history half as well; and if this book was written before the war and by a historian who then sympathised with Germany, the result is at least a corrective of the inevitable but unintellectual tendency to see red in German history.

The period covered in this volume is, as its author admits, a "dreary period of German history"; but its very dreariness explains the enthusiasm of Germans for the Prussian State which changed the pettiness, distraction, and anarchy of the Germanic Confederation into the vigour, order, and megalomania of the German Empire. The last five years of the period are, moreover, anything but dull; they were confused, and they led to what we regard as deplorable results in the triumph of reaction. But they were the most critical years in European history between the peace of 1815 and the war of 1914; and without some knowledge of that period it will be impossible to understand the causes of the present war or the problems

of the future peace. The book is not one for schoolboys or schoolgirls, and even teachers will not find it easy reading; but it is an authoritative book, on the scholarship of which implicit reliance may be placed. It is neither a philippic nor an apology, but history.

W.

Sevastopol. Leo Tolstoy. Edited by A. P. Goudy and E. Bullough. Cambridge: At the University Press. 1916.

Sevastopol is one of Tolstoy's earliest works, and was actually published during the Crimean War. But English readers will seek in vain for any description of our army or such battles as Inkerman. The work is a description of war generally, and attracted attention at once by its characteristically Russian realism. It is important as being an early sketch of the great epic which the author produced later on in *War and Peace*.

This new edition of the Russian text is the first of what we hope will be a series of Russian texts issued by the Cambridge University Press. So far the increasing band of Russian learners in this country have been dependent on a few meagre extracts in Russian grammars and such Russian paper books, often badly printed, as have filtered through into this country. *Sevastopol* cannot be called an easy book for beginners, but the style is excellent. Moreover, the editors have done their work so well that it is possible for every student of Russian to read it with ease. There is a glossary, a concise historical introduction, and excellent notes dealing fully with all difficult points, such as the use of the aspects of the verb. This work is a most suitable book for English students to commence on, as it shows how false a conception of the Russian character was held by our ancestors, blinded as they were by a generation of prejudice and antagonism against their opponents in the Crimean War. It will help us to a better appreciation of the valiant deeds of the Russian army in the present war. We owe a debt of gratitude both to the editors and to the University Press. A carefully edited Russian text like this is worth a dozen of the poor translations which are appearing every week.

A. Bruce Boswell.

German, Slav, and Magyar: a Study in the Origins of the Great War. By R. W. Seton-Watson, D.Litt., Lecturer in East European History, King's College, London. Williams and Norgate. Pp. 198. 1916.

This is one of the books which make a real contribution to our understanding of the causes of the war and render unmistakable service to the cause of permanent settlement. No settlement can be permanent which does not deal drastically with that composite entity which we miscall the Dual Monarchy; for Austria-Hungary, organised or disorganised as it was in 1914, was a standing or rather a tottering menace to the peace of Europe; and it will continue to be a menace, after peace is made, unless that settlement provides some peace for the harassed peoples of the Habsburg Empire. Hence the value of Dr. Seton-Watson's volume. He is no armchair historian; he has travelled, or rather lived, for years among the nationalities whose history and politics he sketches in these pages. He knows their languages, their habits, their outlook, and their leaders; and he speaks for them with an authority which no other Briton possesses. We heartily commend this volume to the public, and the price at

which it is published makes even war-taxation an inadequate excuse for eschewing purchase, at any rate on the part of libraries which are not taxed.

A University Reader of some repute has recently declared that "in 1878–1914 Europe consists of solid blocks, which stoutly resist every attempt to break them up." It is an astonishing sentence in a volume dealing with a conflagration started in the Balkans by friction with Austro-Hungary; and it emphasises the need for Dr. Seton-Watson's book. For how a historian, even in a moment of forgetfulness, can have thought of South-Eastern Europe as consisting of solid blocks passes comprehension; apart from the Balkan welter, the Habsburg Empire itself, as Dr. Seton-Watson remarks, is "a country of eleven main races, ten principal languages, and twenty-three legislative bodies." There were three alternative methods of retaining these diverse elements under Habsburg sway—centralism, dualism, and federalism. Centralism was the old method of Metternich; dualism was the method established by the *Ausgleich* of 1867; federalism was the only method which might have proved tolerable and successful. Dualism merely had the effect of giving the Magyars a freer hand than they would otherwise have enjoyed in oppressing the Serbs, Croats, Rumanes, and Saxons within their borders; and the tyranny exercised by the Magyar makes him a little lower than the Prussian, if a little higher than the Turk—Bernhardi's "natural" allies.

We cannot follow Dr. Seton-Watson through his masterly analysis of the racial problem of South-Eastern Europe; but we feel bound to enter a *caveat* against some of his criticisms of recent British foreign policy. The Allies are all involved, though Dr. Watson writes as though what faults there were have been purely British. On p. 118 he says:

"It is to be hoped that a just Nemesis will ere long overtake the statesmen who, so far from realising this elementary truth [that "Serbia is one of the pivots of our Continental policy"], steadily refused to avow Serbia as their ally, secretly bartered away the dearest possessions of her race, withheld the military aid which would have prevented Germany from conquering the Balkans, and ensured the entry of Roumania, and at last were too late to save her at the moment of her death agony."

This cannot be accepted as history. The misfortunes of Serbia last autumn were due to no diplomatic *lâches*, but to the military successes of Germany, which drove Russia back from Warsaw behind the Dvina and the Pripet marshes, convinced Bulgaria of the ultimate success of the Central Empires, and temporarily constrained Rumania into caution, but to which Dr. Seton-Watson makes no allusion. It is sheer madness to assume that Great Britain and France could then have transported to the Danube a military force capable of counterbalancing the Russian *débâcle* and withstanding the German, Austrian, Bulgarian, and Turkish forces in the Balkans. Had we possessed that military omnipotence, our first duty would have been to Belgium and our second to France, both of which obligations are ignored by Dr. Seton-Watson. As for "bartering away the dearest possessions" of the Serbian race, whatever that may mean, Dr. Watson himself condemns the Allies for having ignored Bulgaria's "overtures to intervene on their side" in spite of the conditions attached (p. 109), and suggests on pp. 178–9, 185, the cession of Kavala and the placing of the Vardar valley at the disposal of both

the Serbian and Bulgar races, while denouncing on p. 172 the "consummate folly of our statesmen" in "bargaining with Bulgaria." Nor is it altogether prudent to invoke "a just Nemesis" upon the failure of our statesmen to realise the "elementary truth" that "the erection of a strong and unified Southern Slav State . . . is one of the most vital British interests in this war," when Dr. Watson confesses two pages later (p. 120) that in 1913, in a German edition of his *Southern Slav Question*, he was "pleading the cause of Southern Slav Unity in an Austrophil sense." For the accomplishment of that design would have done more for "Mittel-Europa" than all the successes of Germany and the failures of the Allies in this war. Dr. Seton-Watson's great quality of fervid concentration upon the Jugo-Slav cause has its defect in a limited comprehension of the complexity of British foreign policy.

D.

An Introduction to the Study of International Relations. By A. J. Grant, Arthur Greenwood, J. D. I. Hughes, P. H. Kerr, and F. F. Urquhart. Macmillan. 1916. Pp. viii., 207. 2*s. n.*

The essays that constitute this volume were written, we are told in the preface, "at the suggestion of the Council for the Study of International Relations." They are the work of a group of writers who were profoundly shocked by the outbreak of war in August 1914, and have set themselves to review the course of international relations since 1815 in order, if possible, to discover the reasons for the failure of the hopes of peace and to estimate its prospects in future generations. Disillusionment is the underlying note throughout the book. It is not that peace, and prolonged peace, is not likely to follow this war. Long periods of peace have generally followed great wars, and every great settlement in modern times has been accompanied by schemes for preventing future wars. But the war-weary generation has always passed away, to be succeeded by a renewal of wars on an ever-larger scale; and it looks as though, just as every generation of children has to be taught afresh at school, so every (or nearly every) generation of adults has to suffer again the barbarous discipline of war. The truth is that nationality, upon which extravagant hopes of peace were set in the nineteenth century, is no preventive of war unless it is properly understood; just as true liberty consists not so much in the assertion of one's own liberties as in the respect for other people's, so the real principle of nationality involves a recognition of the national rights of others, and nationalism without internationalism is as fatal to peace as unrestricted liberty is to law and orderly government.

The difficulty lies in the absence of means to restrain and pacify national ambitions. Cavour, Napoleon III., and Bismarck all believed, as Professor Grant points out, in war as a legitimate means of national expansion; and Mr. Urquhart gently exposes the ideal of a "static" world. How, without war, are we to adjust the government of the world to the natural growth and retrogression of its peoples? Mr. Hughes makes a brave, but it seems to us quite inconclusive, effort to magnify the value of international law: "Even if international law were never enforced at all, it would serve its purpose by affording a standard for the judgement of conduct" (p. 134). This is not law, but ethics, and Mr. Hughes further identifies law with conventions and customs. Positive law was developed in order to deal with those who paid no respect to natural law or customs; and it always depended for its usefulness upon the means for its

enforcement. When the difficulty is to make international morality binding on those who refuse to admit its claims, we are not helped by calling it law and contending that law is independent of execution; and to say that "the sole function of a system of law is to provide a considered measure by which conduct may be judged as legal or illegal" (p. 123) is to confuse the jurist with the lawyer and to abandon the sphere of practical politics. In point of fact, too, we were not "bound by treaty to enter the war in defence of Belgian neutrality" (p. 124): the "scrap of paper" binds its signatories not to violate Belgian neutrality, and gives each the right to intervene in case of such violation, but it does not bind them to intervene.

Mr. Greenwood, like Mr. J. A. Hobson, seems to think more of an economic boycott than of international law, as a preventive of war. We doubt its deterrent effect; as it is, war automatically puts an end to commercial intercourse between belligerents, and neutrals will always be jealous of their special advantage. A general boycott would have to depend upon a sort of general excommunication of the aggressor by some international tribunal; and to obtain a general consent to be bound by such a tribunal is the problem. If it were really secured, war, and consequently the occasion for the boycott, would never arise. Mr. Kerr comes nearer to the heart of the problem by insisting (p. 143) that "the question is not a national but a human question." States are built on the more or less accidental *differentia* of mankind; the settlement must be based on the common denominators of humanity, and the function of international studies is to discover and promote the greatest common measure of mankind.

A. F. Pollard.

SHORT NOTICES.

The noticeable improvement in the methods of history teaching in schools, that has been so marked a feature in American education in the past few years, has been greatly aided by the appearance of really good text-books from the pens of historians of recognised authority in the universities. *The Plain Story of American History*, by Prof. J. S. Bassett, of Smith College (New York: Macmillans, 1916, 4*s*. 6*d*. net), is an excellent example of a textbook that really does something to tell, in a clear and intelligible form, the story of human achievement in that part of the Western Hemisphere which is now the United States of America. The pupils who use it will begin to realise that their history has been made not merely by the statesman and the soldier, but also by the social reformer and the pioneer; and while their interest will be aroused by the stories of great and heroic deeds, they will be led by the clear and straightforward exposition of the way in which their Government works to seek to know more of the process by which during the last three hundred years the American nation has been built up. The well-chosen illustrations and the excellent maps with which the book is provided add much to its value, and it may safely be commended to the attention of English teachers.

A. P. N.

Messrs. Headley Bros. send us *An Introductory Atlas of International Relations* (1*s*. 6*d*. n.), compiled by Messrs. Henry Clay and Arthur Greenwood, with maps by H. S. Hattin. The letterpress runs to seventy-four pages, and there are forty-seven maps. The introduction is a suggestive survey of the various causes which pre-determine

the course of international relations; and the notes provide very useful historical information to accompany the maps. The volume might well be called an historical atlas of the modern world. The maps are not in colour; but one cannot expect everything for eighteenpence, and students learn a good deal by putting in their own colours. The book should be treated as an indispensable item in the apparatus of a study-circle or a history-class in the higher forms of schools.

We have received from Messrs. W. and R. Chambers specimen copies of the two series of Historical Readers, each of which includes six small volumes, ranging in price from 10*d.* to 1*s.* 6*d.* The one series, entitled "New Scheme History Readers," is arranged on the concentric plan; that is to say, each book, from the first, which contains "Stories from British History" to the sixth, which provides an "Advanced History of England," covers chronologically, with less or more detail, the whole course of our national development. The other series is "periodic." The books, although carefully graded in difficulty, are entirely different from one another in their subject-matter. The first two books (not yet published) are to supply preliminary training in historical tales: the remaining four together give a consecutive and complete, though increasingly detailed, history of England and the British Empire. A comparison of the two series—each excellent of its kind—leads us without hesitation to express our preference for the "periodic" over the "concentric." The greater freshness and fulness of the former seem to us much more likely to maintain interest and quicken imagination than the six-fold repetition of the latter. It is more important, however, in the case of the "periodic" readers than in the case of the "concentric" that pupils should work through the whole series. If they do not do so, they will entirely miss some vitally significant epoch. Hence the "concentric" series will continue to have its place and do its work in regions where population is migratory, and where the roll of the school-classes fluctuates rapidly.

F. J. C. H.

A new periodical venture of considerable interest and importance is *The New Europe* (Constable, 6*d.* weekly since October 19th). Its motto is *pour la victoire intégrale*, but the emphasis is all on the necessity of a complete re-settlement of South-eastern Europe, including the liberation of the subject races of the Habsburgs and the frustration of the Berlin-Baghdad scheme. It is an expansion and continuation of Dr. Seton-Watson's propaganda; but it is written by first-rate authorities, and contains a mass of information not available elsewhere.

From the Polish Information Committee we have received, besides its weekly *Polish News*, a lecture on *Joseph Poniatowski* by Szymon Askenazy, another on *Intellectual Poland* by Leon Litwinski, and a *Review of the British War Literature on the Polish Problem*.

The Duke of Cesarò sends us his *Quadruple Diplomacy in the Balkans: its Errors and Remedies*, a severe criticism from an Italian point of view.

We have received the October number of the *Catholic Historical Review*, published by the Catholic University of America at Washington, D.C. Most of its pages are devoted to the history of Catholicism in America, but the Bibliography (pp. 367–72) contains a section on Palæography which will prove useful to students of history in general.

NEW BOOKS AND NEW EDITIONS.

[Under this head it is proposed to give a list of most of the books dealing with history which have appeared during the preceding quarter, with an indication of the contents when they are not clearly expressed in the title. The references are, unless otherwise stated, to notices in The Times Literary Supplement, *the pages of which are numbered continuously and can therefore be identified without specification of date.]*

THE ARCHÆOLOGY OF THE HOLY LAND. By P. S. P. Handcock. 383 pp. Fisher Unwin. 10*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 500.)

A CLASSICAL DICTIONARY of Greek and Roman Antiquities, Biography, Geography, and Mythology Ed. H. B. Walters. x+1103 pp. Cambridge Univ. Press. 21*s. n.* (pp. 520, 561, 589, 614.)

THE SEVEN WONDERS of the Ancient World. By E. J. Banks. xi+191 pp. Putnams. 6*s.* 6*d. n.*

DIO'S ROMAN HISTORY. Trans. E. Cary. Vol. IV. 502 pp. PROCOPIUS. Trans. H. B. Dewing. Vol. II., History of the Wars, Bks. iii. and iv. 488 pp. PLUTARCH'S LIVES. Trans. B. Perrin. Vol. IV., Alcibiades and Coriolanus, Lysander and Sulla. ix+467 pp. (The Loeb Classical Library.) Heinemann. 5*s. n.* each. (p. 602.)

PHASES OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY. By J. Estlin Carpenter. xvi+449 pp. Putnams. 10*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 556.)

CHRISTIANITY AND NATIONALISM in the Later Roman Empire. By E. L. Woodward. vii+106 pp. Longmans. 3*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 621.)

ITALY AND HER INVADERS. By T. Hodgkin. Vols. V. and VI., The Lombard Invasion and Kingdom. Second edition. xxiii+484+xvi+635 pp. Clarendon Press. 36*s. n.* (p. 544.)

MAHOMET. By G. M. Draycott. 351 pp. Martin Secker. 10*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 509.)

MOHAMMEDANISM. By C. S. Hurgronje. xi+184 pp. Putnams. 6*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 509.)

LEABHAR GABHALA, the Book of Conquests in Ireland. Pt. i. Ed. R. A. Stewart Macalister and John MacNeill. 285 pp. Hodges, Figgis. 5*s. n.*

A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH of the Cymry. By W. Hughes. New edition, revised. xv+412 pp. Elliot Stock. 10*s. n.*

DENMARK AND SWEDEN with Iceland and Finland. By Jon Stefansson. Preface by Viscount Bryce. ("Story of the Nations" Series.) 380 pp. Fisher Unwin. 7*s.* 6*d. n.*

A SHORT HISTORY of Germany (9—1914 A.D.). By E. F. Henderson. 2 vols. New edition, with additional chapters. xiii+517+604 pp. The Macmillan Co. 15*s. n.*

A MANUAL OF THE WRITINGS IN MIDDLE-ENGLISH, 1050—1400. By J. E. Wells. xv+941 pp. Yale Univ. Press. 21*s. n.*

A HISTORY of the Irish Dominicans. Vol. I., Bishops, 1224—1307. By M. H. MacInerny. xi+635 pp. Dublin: Browne and Nolan. 10*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 636.)

SURNAMES. By E. Weekley. xxii+364 pp. Murray. 6*s. n.* (p. 546.)

CAL. PATENT ROLLS, Henry VII., Vol. II., 1494—1509. viii+889 pp. H.M. Stationery Office. 21*s.*

THE LADY MARGARET, Mother of Henry VII. By W. B. Hanson. 125+xiv pp. Talbot. 3*s. n.*

STATE POLICY IN IRISH EDUCATION, 1536—1816. Exemplified in documents. Intro. (31 pp.) by T. Corcoran. 235 pp. Longmans. 6*s. n.* (*Educ. Supplt.*, p. 151.)

THE TRUE HISTORY of the Conquest of New Spain. By Bernal Diaz del Castillo. Ed. by Genaro Garcia. Trans., Intro., and Notes by A. P. Maudsley. Vol. V. xv+463 pp. Hakluyt Soc. (p. 600.)

GIORDANO BRUNO. By W. Boulting. viii+315 pp. Kegan Paul. 10*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 484.)

THE INSTITUTION OF THE ARCH-PRIEST BLACKWELL. A Study of . . . Church Government, 1595—1602. By J. H. Pollen. xi+106 pp. Longmans. 5*s. n.*

HISTOIRE DE L'ENTENTE CORDIALE Franco-Anglaise, les Relations de la France et de l'Angleterre depuis le XVIe siècle jusqu'à nos jours. Par J. L. de Lanessan. F. Alcan. 3.50 f. (p. 456.)

THE COLONIAL TARIFF POLICY of France. By A. Girault. Ed. C. Gide. ix+305 pp. Clarendon Press. 7*s.* 6*d. n.*

IRELAND under the Stuarts and during the Interregnum. By R. Bagwell. Vol. III., 1660—1690. xi+351 pp. Longmans. 15*s. n.* (p. 496.)

INDIA. Part I., History to the end of the East India Company. By P. E. Roberts. (A Historical Geography of the British Dependencies, Ed. Sir C. P. Lucas, Vol. VII.) 415 pp. Clarendon Press. 6*s.* 6*d.*

HISTORY OF AURANGZIB. By Jadunath Sartiar. Vol. III., 1658—1681. xii+447 pp. Heffer. 5*s. n.*

THE STORY OF GONDWANA. By the

Rt. Rev. E. Chatterton, Bishop of Nagpur. xix+229 pp. Pitman. 10*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 495.)

A Calendar of the Court Minutes, etc., of the East India Company, 1655—1659. By Ethel B. Sainsbury. Intro. and notes by W. Foster. xxxiv+387 pp. Clarendon Press. 12*s.* 6*d. n.* p. 566.)

The Founding of Spanish California, 1687—1783. By C. E. Chapman. xxxii+485 pp. The Macmillan Co. 15*s. n.*

Cal. State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, 1706—June, 1708. Ed. Cecil Headlam. lviii+871 pp. H. M. Stationery Office. 15*s.*

Histoire de Samuel Bernard (1654—1730). Par E. de Clermont-Tonnerre. Paris: Champion. 12 f. (p. 548.)

Political Ballads illustrating the administration of Sir R. Walpole. Ed. M. Percival (Oxford Historical and Literary Studies, ed. C. H. Firth and W. Raleigh, Vol. VIII.). lviii+211 pp. Clarendon Press. 8*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 523.)

Letters of John Wesley: a selection by G. Eayrs. Intro. by A. Birrell. Hodder and Stoughton. 10*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 461.)

Social Life in England, 1750—1850. By F. J. Foakes Jackson. ix+338 pp. Macmillan. 5*s. n.* (p. 620.)

Carlyle's Frederick the Great. Abridged and ed. A. M. D. Hughes. xxxii+376 pp. Clarendon Press. 3*s. n.*

The Diary of Ananda Ranga Pillai. Ed. H. Dodwell. Vol. IV. (1747—8). xv+505 pp. Madras: The Government Press. 4*s.* 6*d.*

With Americans of Past and Present days. By J. J. Jusserand. xi+350 pp. Fisher Unwin. 8*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 460; *Spectator*, Nov. 18th.)

Collected addresses, the first of which throws "new light on the motives which led France to assist the American colonists."

French Policy and the American Alliance. By E. S. Corwin. ix+430 pp. Princeton Univ. Press. 8*s.* 6*d. n.*

The American Plan of Government. By C. W. Bacon and F. S. Morse. Intro. G. G. Battle. xxi+474 pp. Putnams. 6*s.* 6*d. n.*

British Colonial Policy, 1783—1915. By C. H. Currey. 266 pp. Clarendon Press. 2*s.* 6*d.*

The National History of France: The French Revolution. By L. Madelin. xiii+662 pp. Heinemann. 7*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 508.)

Lord Edward [Fitzgerald]: a Study in Romance. By Katharine Tynan. vii+310 pp. Smith, Elder. 7*s.* 6*d. n.*

Church and Reform in Scotland, 1797—1843. By W. L. Mathieson. xii+378 pp. Maclehose. 10*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 569.)

Henry Dundas, Viscount Melville. By J. A. Lovat Fraser. x+146 pp. Cambridge Univ. Press. 3*s.* 6*d. n.*

Europe in the XIX. Century. By J. E. Morris. vi+278 pp. Maps. Cambridge Univ. Press. 2*s.* 6*d. n.*

Europe in the Nineteenth Century. By E. Lipson. iv+298 pp., 8 portraits, 4 maps. Black. 4*s.* 6*d. n.* (pp. 470, 501.)

The Termination of War and Treaties of Peace. By C. Phillipson. xix+486 pp. Fisher Unwin. 21*s. n.* (p. 507.)

A collection of the chief treaties since 1815, with an analysis of their provisions.

The Ontario Grammar Schools (1807—1916). By W. E. Macpherson. (Bulletin of the Dept. of History, Queen's Univ.) 22 pp. Kingston: The Jackson Press. (*Educ. Supplt.*, p. 215: "A valuable chapter in the imperial history of education.")

Historical Records of Australia. Series I., Governors' Despatches to and from England. Vol. VII., Jan., 1809—June, 1813. xx+908 pp. Library Committee of the Commonwealth Parliament.

America's Foreign Relations. By W. F. Johnson. 2 vols. xiii+551+ix+485 pp. Eveleigh Nash. 24*s. n.*

The Monroe Doctrine. By A. B. Hart. xv+445 pp. Duckworth. 10*s.* 6*d.* (p. 555.)

Gladstone's Speeches: a selection, with full descriptive Index and Bibliography. By A. T. Bassett. Preface by Viscount Bryce. Intro. by Herbert Paul. xi+667 pp. Methuen. 12*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 569.)

Seventy-one Years of a Guardsman's Life. By Gen. Sir G. Higginson. xi+403 pp. Smith, Elder. 10*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 546.)

Deals mainly with the Crimean War.

Reminiscences of a War-time Statesman and Diplomatist, 1830—1915. By F. W. Seward. xi+489 pp. Putnams. 18*s. n.* (pp. 581, 625.)

Lord Lyons. By Lord Newton. 570 pp. Nelson. 1*s.* 3*d. n.*

Chapters from My Official Life. By Sir C. Rivers Wilson. xv+310 pp. Arnold. 12*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 484.)

The Life and Letters of Sir Charles Tupper. Ed. E. M. Saunders. Intro. Sir R. L. Borden. 2 vols. xi+319+298 pp. Cassell. 25*s. n.* (p. 531.)

Mounted Police Life in Canada. By Capt. R. Burton Deane. 312 pp. Cassell. 6*s. n.* (p. 463.)

The Book of the Victoria Cross.

Compiled by Major R. Stewart. xxv +555 pp. Hugh Rees. 6*s. n.*

F.-M. Lord Kitchener. By E. S. Grew, G. Turnbull, and W. Huyshe. 2 vols. xii+241+x+240 pp. Gresham Publishing Co. 17*s. n.* (p. 612.)

Things I Remember. By S. Whitman. Cassell. 7*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 494.)

The Camera as Historian. A handbook. By H. D. Gower, L. Stanley Jast, and W. W. Topley. xv+259 pp. Sampson Low. 6*s. n.*

The Purpose of History. By F. J. E. Woodbridge. 89 pp. Columbia Univ. Press. 4*s.* 6*d. n.*

Source Problems in English History. By A. B. White and W. Notestein. Intro. D. C. Munro. xv+422 pp. Harpers. 5*s.* 6*d.* (*Educ. Supplt.*, p. 207.)

CURRENT HISTORY AND POLITICS.

Imperial Germany. By Prince von Bülow. Trans. M. A. Lewenz. Foreword J. W. Headlam. New ed. Cassell. 6*s. n.* (p. 519.)

Belgium's Case. By Ch. de Visscher. Trans. E. F. Jourdain. Preface J. van den Heuvel. xxiv+164 pp. Hodder and Stoughton. 3*s.* 6*d. n.*

German Legislation for the Occupied Territories. Official texts, ed. C. H. Huberich and A. Nicol-Speyer. 5th Series, Oct.—Dec., 1915. 271 pp. The Hague: M. Nijhoff. 8*s.* 6*d. n.*

The "Fortnightly" History of the War. By Col. A. M. Murray. Foreword by F.-M. Sir E. Wood. Vol. I. xviii+403 pp. Maps. Chapman and Hall. 10*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 580.)

A Supplement to Letters to "The Times" upon War and Neutrality (1914), containing letters 1914—16. By T. E. Holland. 35 pp. Longmans. 1*s. n.*

Labour, Finance, and the War. Ed. A. W. Kirkaldy. Published by authority of the British Assoc. Pitmans. 3*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 495.)

The Elements of Reconstruction. Intro. Viscount Milner. 120 pp. Nisbet. 1*s. n.*

Political Frontiers and Boundary-Making. By Col. Sir T. H. Holdich. xi+307 pp. Macmillan. 10*s. n.* (pp. 483, 513, 525.)

Recueil de Rapports sur les différents points du programme minimum (Organization Centrale pour une Paix durable). Pt. ii. viii+355 pp. The Hague: M. Nijhoff.

Nationalism and Internationalism. By Ramsay Muir. 229 pp. Constable. 4*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 518.)

The Restoration of Europe. By A. H. Fried. Trans. L. S. Gannett. xiv+157 pp. Macmillan Co. 4*s.* 6*d. n.*

The Parliament of Man. By M. A. Müggе. 274 pp. C. W. Daniel. 6*s. n.*

Nationalism, War and Society. By E. Koehbiel. Intro. Norman Angell. xxxv+276 pp. The Macmillan Co. 6*s.* 6*d. n.*

Authority, Liberty and Function in the Light of the War. By R. de Maetzu. 288 pp. Allen and Unwin. 4*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 566.)

The Future of Militarism: an Examination of "Ordeal by Battle." By "Roland." 185 pp. Fisher Unwin. 2*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 458.)

The Problems and Lessons of the War: Clark University Addresses. Ed. G. H. Blakeslee. Intro. G. Stanley Hall. xlvi+381 pp. Putnams. 8*s.* 6*d. n.*

Europe Unbound. By L. March Phillipps. xii+212 pp. Duckworth. 6*s. n.*

Principles of Social Reconstruction. By Bertrand Russell. 252 pp. Allen and Unwin. 6*s. n.* (p. 566.)

Jean Jaurès. By Margaret Pease. Intro. J. Ramsay Macdonald. 157 pp. Headley. 2*s. n.* (p. 497.)

La Guerre et les Neutres. Par R. Moulin. Plon-Nourrit. 3.50 f.

La Politique de la Grèce. Par E. Venizelos. Préface de J. Reinach. Edition de l'Imprimerie de l'Est. 3 f. (p. 471.)

A translation of six speeches delivered in the Greek Chamber, Oct. and Nov., 1915.

Poland's Case for Independence. (Six pamphlets issued by the Polish Information Committee.) 352 pp. Allen and Unwin. 7*s.* 6*d. n.* (pp. 542, 561, 589.)

The Problem of Danish Sleswig. By H. Rosendal. Trans. A. Troensegaard-Hansen. 40 pp. Clarendon Press. 8d. (p. 518.)

Vem har Ratt i Varldskriget. Af K. G. Ossiannilsson. Stockholm: H. Lundberg och Gösto Olzon. 80 öre. (p. 543.)

Sweden: Historical and Statistical Handbook. Ed. J. Guinchard. English issue. Part I., Land and People, xxvi+781 pp.; Part II., Industries, xi+759 pp. Stockholm: Government Printing Office. (See above, p. 128.)

The Insurrection in Ireland (Easter, 1916). By James Stephens. xiv+111 pp. Maunsel. 2*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 485.)

The Irish Rebellion of 1916. By W. B. Wells and N. Marlowe. xii+271 pp. Maunsel. 7*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 549.)

The National Being: Some Thoughts on Irish Polity. By "A. E." 176 pp. Maunsel. 4*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 459.)

DEMOCRACY and Empire. By A. E. Duchesne. (Royal Colonial Institute Monographs.) vii+120 pp. Milford. 2*s.* 6*d. n.*

THE EMPIRE and the Future: a Series of Lectures delivered in the University of London, King's College. xv+110 pp. Macmillan. 2*s. n.* (p. 543.)

CANADA'S FUTURE. Ed. E. A. Victor. xxix+320 pp. Toronto: The Macmillan Co. 6*s. n.*

THE CANADIAN ANNUAL REVIEW of Public Affairs, 1915. By J. C. Hopkins. 837 pp. Toronto: The *Annual Review* Publishing Co.

ADDRESSES on International Subjects. By Elihu Root. Harvard Univ. Press. 8*s.* 6*d. n.*

THE AMERICAN CRISIS and the War. By W. M. Fullerton. 138+6 pp. Constable. 2*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 494.)

THE PRESIDENT of the United States. By Woodrow Wilson. 71 pp. Harpers. 2*s. n.*

AMERICANIZATION. By Royal Dixon. ix+196 pp. The Macmillan Co. 2*s. n.*

TRADE, POLITICS AND CHRISTIANITY in Africa and the East. By A. J. Macdonald. Intro. Sir H. Johnston. xxi +296 pp. Longmans. 6*s. n.* (p. 520.)

MANDARIN and Missionary in Cathay. By E. F. Borst-Smith. 268 pp. Seeley, Service. 5*s. n.*

FORTY-FIVE YEARS IN CHINA (since 1869). By T. Richard. 384 pp. Fisher Unwin. 10*s.* 6*d. n.*

LOCAL HISTORY.

PROC. OF THE PREHISTORIC SOC. of East Anglia, 1915—16. Vol. II., Pt. ii. Pp. 161—325. H. K. Lewis. 3*s.* 6*d. n.*

THE PARISH REGISTERS of Hunsdon, Herts, 1546—1837. By the Hon. H. C. Gibbs. viii+346 pp. St. Catherine Press. 42*s. n.*

HISTORY OF THE CUTLERS' COMPANY. By C. Welch. Vol. I., to 1500. xx+ 372 pp. Privately printed.

LE STRANGE RECORDS (Norfolk and the March of Wales, A.D. 1100—1310). By H. Le Strange. xiv+407 pp. Longmans. 21*s. n.* (p. 557.)

NORTHUMBERLAND. By J. E. Morris. xv+364 pp. Methuen. 2*s.* 6*d. n.*

STAFFORDSHIRE INCUMBENTS and Parochial Records, 1530—1680. By W. N. Landor. lxxvii+450 pp. William Salt Archæological Soc. Subscription, £1 1*s.* (p. 500, and *Educ. Supplt.*, p. 175.)

CLEATOR and Cleator Moor, Past and Present. By C. Caine. Kendal: T. Wilson. 21*s.*

RYDAL. By M. L. Armitt. Ed. W. F. Rawnsley. 700 pp. Kendal: T. Wilson. (p. 497.)

A DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGUE of Miscellaneous Charters and other Documents relating to the districts of Sheffield and Rotherham, with abstracts of Sheffield wills proved at York from 1554 to 1560. Compiled by T. W. Hall. 291 pp. Sheffield: J. W. Northend.

SCHOOL-BOOKS.

HISTORY'S BACKGROUND. Book I., Eurasia, including the Mediterranean Region. By J. S. Townsend and T. Franklin. 152 pp. Johnston. 1*s.* 6*d. n.* (*Educ. Supplt.*, p. 239.)

HISTORY THROUGH ILLUSTRATIONS. Book I., Prehistoric Times to 1154. 188 pp. Pitman. 3*s. n.* (*Educ. Supplt.*, p. 239.)

ANCIENT TIMES. An Introduction to the study of Ancient History. By J. H. Breasted. xx+742 pp. Ginn. 6*s.* 6*d. n.* (*Educ. Supplt.*, p. 199.)

THE DAYS OF ALKIBIADES. By C. E. Robinson. xxiv+301 pp. Arnold. 5*s. n.* (p. 503; *Educ. Supplt.*, p. 175.)

ROMAN LIFE and Customs. A Latin Reader. By R. A. A. Beresford and E. C. Smith. 104 pp. Blackie. 2*s.* (*Educ. Supplt.*, p 199.)

MEDIEVAL AND MODERN TIMES. By J. H. Robinson. xii+777 pp. Ginn. 6*s.* 6*d. n.* (*Educ. Supplt.*, p. 199.)

A YEAR BOOK of English History. Year Book Press. 1*s. n.*

AN INTRODUCTION to the History of England. By E. L. Hasluck. 277 pp. Black. 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE ENGLISH COUNTRY GENTLEMAN in Literature. By Guy N. Pocock. 96 pp. Blackie. 1*s.* (*Educ. Supplt.*, p. 191.)

A FIRST HISTORY of India. By J. N. Fraser. 2nd edition. 176 pp. Bombay: K. and J. Cooper. 1*s. n.*

TALES OF TRAVEL: Through the British Empire, 176 pp.; Adventures in Polar Seas, 148 pp. By J. W. Oates. Harrap. 1*s.* 3*d.* each.

THE FOUNDATION and Growth of the British Empire. By J. A. Williamson. xii+290 pp. Macmillan. 2*s.* 6*d.*

BRIEF HISTORY of the United States. By M. P. Andrews. xvii+368+xxviii (appendices). J. B. Lippincott. (*Educ. Supplt.*, p. 215.)

THE POLITICAL HISTORY OF FRANCE, 1789—1910. By Muriel O. Davies. 151 pp. Clarendon Press. 2*s.* 6*d. n.* (*Educ. Supplt.*, p. 159.)

E. J. D.

INDEX TO VOLUME I.

ARTICLES.

	PAGE
EDITORIAL	1
THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF CONSTANTINOPLE. By Norman H. Baynes	65
NEW LIGHT ON ST. FRANCIS AND HIS ORDER. By Walter W. Seton, D.Lit.	80
LUDLOW: A STUDY IN LOCAL HISTORY. By J. E. Morris, D.Litt., Litt.D.	159
MILITARY SERVICE IN A FLEMISH COMMUNE. By A. Abram, D.Sc.... ...	215
A MOSSTROOPER. By Ruth Dodds	222
THE COLONISATION OF ULSTER. By Constantia Maxwell 86,	147
THE GROWTH OF AN IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT. By Prof. A. F. Pollard, Litt.D.	129
THE MAKING OF AN IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT. I. By Prof. Ramsay Muir ...	193
II. By D. O. Malcolm ...	199
FIFTY YEARS OF BRITISH FOREIGN POLICY. By Prof. Walter J. Harte ...	97
THE TEACHING OF IMPERIAL HISTORY. By Sir Charles Lucas, K.C.B., K.C.M.G.	5
THE TEACHING OF NAVAL AND MILITARY HISTORY. I. By Julian Corbett	12
II. By H. W. Hodges	19
HISTORY AND SCIENCE: A REJOINDER. By Prof. A. F. Pollard, Litt.D....	25

NOTES AND NEWS.

The closing of Museums, 40; Bibliographies of International Relations and Ancient History, 41; the Five Associations and the Council for Humanistic Studies, 41, 108, 174–5, 234, 236; the teaching of Patriotism, 42; Imperial Studies Committees and Lectures, 42–3, 110; the function of the newer Universities, 43–4; history and citizenship, 44, 175–6; the scope and aims of historical study and teaching, 108–9, 176, 234; opportunities for the teacher of history, 109–110; the Council for the Study of International Relations, 110; naval history, 111; the imprisonment of MM. Pirenne and Frédéricq, 111; the alleged German inspiration of the *English Historical Review*, 112; historians killed in the war, 176, 236; Dr. Fisher's appointment as Minister of Education, 233; the problem of curricula and objections to uniformity, 234; the teaching of history and modern languages, 235; Council's report on history scholarship examinations, 235; post-graduate courses, 236; the teaching of history in Ireland, 236.

CORRESPONDENCE.

"History" (Mrs. Dobson), 45; provision for historical studies by Education Authorities (J. A. White), 45–6; the teaching of English, European, and Imperial History in schools (Miss Constance Stewart), 46; (Miss Frances Harris), 47; (Miss J. Noakes), 48; (Miss Woodham Smith), 237; Railways *v.* Reform Bills (C. W. S.), 113; the teaching of naval and military history (G. F. Bridges), 177–8; history teachers, public lectures, and public libraries (Geo. E. Eades), 178–9; ("Historicus"), 237.

BOOKS REVIEWED.

Alvord, Clarence W., and Carter, Clarence E. *The Critical Period*, 1763–1765, and *The New Régime*, 1765–7, 119.

Ashley, Roscoe Lewis, *Early European Civilisation* and *Mediæval Civilisation*, 180.

Athenæum, Subject Index to Periodicals, 124.

Balkans, The ; a History of Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece, Rumania, Turkey, 118.

Bassett, J. S., *The Plain Story of American History*, 251.

Beet, W. E., *A Thousand Years of Papal History*, 186.

Belloc, H., *A History of the War*, 179.

Brown, G. Baldwin, *Saxon Art and Industry in the Pagan Period*, 2 vols., 50.

Browning, Oscar, *A History of the Modern World*, 1815–1910, 185.

Buchan, John, *A History of the War*, 179.

Cahall, Raymond Du Bois, *The Sovereign Council of New France*, 54.

Cesarò, The Duke of, *Quadruple Diplomacy in the Balkans*, 252.

Clare, St., and her Order, 80.

Cunningham, W., *English Influence on the United States*, 188.

Cuthbert, Father, *Life of St. Francis* and *The Romanticism of St. Francis*, 80.

Dodds, Margaret Hope, and Ruth, *The Pilgrimage of Grace*, 2 vols., 52.

Evans, Sir Arthur, *The Adriatic Slavs and the Overland Route to Constantinople*, 124.

George, Hereford B., *Genealogical Tables* (ed. Weaver), 188.

Gilbert, Henry, *The Book of Pirates*, 186.

Gilliat-Smith, E., *Saint Clare of Assisi*, 80.

Green, John Richard, *A Short History of the English People* (new ed.), 239.

Herbert, Sydney, *Modern Europe*, 1789–1914, 187.

Historical Review, The Catholic, 252.

,, ,, *The English*, 112, 123.

,, *Society, The Friends', Journal of*, 124.

Historical Society, The Royal, Camden Series and *Transactions*, 57.

History, the Teaching of, by R. L. Archer, L. V. D. Owen, and A. E. Chapman, 121.

Holland, Edith, *The Story of the Buddha*, 238.

Howe, Mrs. Sonia E., *The False Dmitri*, 243.

International Relations, An Introduction to the Study of, ed. A. Greenwood, 250.

International Relations, An Introductory Atlas of, ed. Clay and Greenwood, 251.

Jörgensen, Johannes, *Saint Francis of Assisi*, 80.

Litwinski, L., *Intellectual Poland*, 252.

McCabe, Joseph, *Crises in the History of the Papacy*, 181.

Macdonald, J. R. Moreton, *A History of France*, 182.

Mackie, R. L., *Scotland*, 242.

McKillian, *A Chronicle of the Popes*, 182*n*.

Monteagle, Anonymous Letter to Lord, 122.

New Europe, The, 252.

Polish News, 123, 252.

Prothero, G. W., *German Opinion and German Policy before the War*, 59.

Readers, Chambers' Historical, 252.

Roberts, W. Rhys, *Patriotic Poetry, Greek and English*, 187.

Russell, Elmer Beecher, *The review of American Colonial Legislation by the King in Council*, 54.

Schleswig-Holstein Question and its place in history, 58.

Seton-Watson, R. W., *German, Slav, and Magyar*, 248.

Smith, G. B., *Outlines of European History*, 1814–1914, 188.

Smith, G. Elliot, *The Influence of Ancient Egyptian Civilisation in the East and in America*, 115.

Smith, L. Cecil, *British History from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*, 2 parts, 117.

Stebbing, *The Story of the Catholic Church*, 182*n*.

Tedder, A. W., *The Navy of the Restoration*, 244.

Terry, C. Sandford, *A Short History of Europe*, 1806–1914, 55.

Theal, G. McC., *The History of South Africa from* 1795 *to* 1872, vols. i–iii, 246.
Tolstoy, Count Leo, *Sevastopol*, ed. A. P. Goudy and E. Bullough, 248.
Tout, T. F., *A Mediæval Burglary*, 122.
Van der Essen, Léon, *A Short History of Belgium*, 116.
Ward, Sir A. W., *Germany* 1815–1852, 247.
Webster, Hutton, *A History of the Ancient World*, 49.
Williams, W. Llew., *Armenia, Past and Present*, 187.
Wolf, A., *The Philosophy of Nietzsche*, 59.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS AND NEW EDITIONS, 60, 125, 189, 253.

INDEX OF CONTRIBUTORS.

Abram, Miss A., D.Sc., 215.
Baynes, Norman H., 49, 65, 180.
Bode, Mrs. Mabel H., 238.
Boswell, A. Bruce, 248.
Bridge, G. F., 177.
Butler, Prof. H. E., 187.
Chambers, R. W., D.Lit., 50.
Corbett, Julian, 12, 244.
Davis, Miss E. Jeffries, 60, 125, 189, 239, 253.
Dobson, Mrs. Portway, 45.
Dodds, Miss Ruth, 222.
Eades, Geo. E., 178.
Grant, Prof. A. J., 182.
Harris, Miss Frances E., 47.
Harte, Prof. W. J., 97.
Hearnshaw, Prof. F. J. C., 121, 186, 252.
Hodges, H. W., 19.
Lucas, Sir Charles, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., 5.
Malcolm, D. O., 199.
Marvin, F. S., 181.
Maxwell, Miss Constantia, 86, 147.
Morris, J. E., D.Litt., Litt.D., 159.
Muir, Prof. Ramsay, 193.
Newton, A. P., D.Lit., 54, 119, 246, 251.
Noakes, Miss J., 48.
Petrie, Prof. W. M. Flinders, F.B.A., F.R.S., D.C.L., 115.
Pollard, Prof. A. F., Litt.D., 25, 55, 57–9, 116, 118, 122–4, 129, 185, 187–8, 243, 250.
Pollard, Mrs. C. S., 186.
Power, Miss E. E., 180.
Reid, Miss Rachel R., D.Lit., 52, 242.
Seton, Walter W., D.Lit., 80.
Smith, Miss P. Woodham, 237.
Stewart, Miss Constance, 46.
White, J. A., 45, 117.

DATE DUE

UIC 3-DAYS

FEB 11 1993

RET'D PER FEB 11 1993

Reserve/Periodical Materials

Reserve/Periodical Materials

Periodical Desk Only

GAYLORD PRINTED IN U.S.A.